

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NEW CHALLENGES IN
INTERNATIONAL TRADE

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, we all are aware of the enormous problems our Nation is experiencing in international trade. We no longer enjoy our former position of prominence as an exporting country. On the other hand, today, we are the biggest importer, providing other exporting countries with a large and prosperous market. There has been considerable commentary about and analysis of this problem, as well as speculation about the proper course to follow to improve our balance of trade.

Last month, at a dinner sponsored by the American Graduate School of International Management, I had the privilege of hearing Robert H. Malott, chairman of the board of FMC Corp., deliver his thoughts on this issue, including his suggestions for improving our balance of trade, and making the international trade market more equitably accessible to all trading nations.

I would like to share Mr. Malott's insights into this critical matter with my colleagues. The text of his remarks follows:

The economic challenges we faced as we entered the 1980's loom increasingly large. Developing countries are struggling to manage foreign debt loads, protectionist pressures are on the increase, and everywhere countries are trying to dispel their economic woes by expanding exports, limiting imports, and passing local content legislation. It is a sobering and disturbing picture.

If there's one overriding issue in world trade today, it seems to me it is the question of the relevance of the general agreement on tariffs and trade. When GATT was established in 1947, the United States was supreme in technology, management skills, and productive capacity. The other major industrialized countries were still recovering from the devastation of World War II, and what we now call the developing countries were primarily struggling for political independence. Since that time, the structure of the world economy has changed dramatically—although the U.S. remains the single largest exporter in the world, we have dropped to second place in the critical area of manufactured goods, and developed and developing countries have become stiff competitors for both our domestic and export markets.

In most of the post-war period, GATT served us well. Through three rounds of trade negotiations, it succeeded in progressively reducing tariffs to a minimum among the industrialized trading nations. But GATT may have been a victim of its own

success. Now that import duties have become almost negligible in many cases, we have moved into the more subtle and complex arena of non-tariff barriers—including export subsidies, import licensing requirements, and local content rules—to name just a few. These are the barriers which are responsible for distorting current trade relationships. These are the barriers which today impede the development of economically sound trade patterns. And these are the barriers which create the increasingly vindictive political issues that interfere with normal relations between nations.

The issue we must face squarely is this: Can GATT handle the realities of today? Can it handle the tough problems of non-tariff barriers? Or do we need new, more comprehensive guidelines on which to base future international trade?

With this issue in mind, I'd like to address five problems in international trade that urgently require solutions.

The first problem concerns the increasing lack of respect for industrial property rights in the international marketplace. In the 1950's, the United States possessed most of the world's technology and controlled the majority of its patents. But since that time, new technology has been transferred out of this country and has become common knowledge throughout the world. Much of this technology transfer has occurred through joint-venture or licensing arrangements, but recently there's been an alarming and expanding disrespect for patent agreements and an increase in surreptitious transfers.

FMC has had to combat this problem with a state-owned enterprise in Hungary that was selling in Brazil a counterfeit version of our pesticide, Furadan. Although we have a valid patent in Brazil for our product, it has taken five years of litigation to stop imports of the Hungarian product into that country.

Many developing countries do not belong to the 1883 Paris convention on industrial property rights, the convention which binds member countries to respect one another's patents. Many that do belong want to change the rules so they can obtain immediate and cost-free access to developed country technology. In the United Nations, where the Paris codes are being revised, developing country Governments have been pressing for agreements which would allow them to seize patented technology and give it to their own domestic firms if multinational patent owners did not exercise their patent rights within a set time period—perhaps as little as 30 months!

Should the developing countries succeed in this effort, they may well impede technology development and transfer throughout the world. For if the industrialized countries have no ability to protect their patents, they will have less incentive to spend money on R & D and, in the long run, will have less technology to transfer.

Recently, FMC has been working with Senator Danforth to amend the U.S. Trade Act of 1974 to give U.S. companies greater recourse against violators of U.S. patent rights. Under this amendment, the President would have powers to raise tariffs, impose quotas, or even revoke most-favored nation status. We believe this change in leg-

islation would be an important first step in preventing other countries from pirating the technology that U.S. firms have worked so long and hard to develop.

In another, more subtle invasion of property rights, a former Common Market commissioner by the name of Vredeling has proposed a plan to the European Parliament which would require multinational companies operating in Europe to share their long-term strategic plans with their labor unions. It would be absurd to try to operate a business effectively if all long-range strategies were laid bare to the competition!

Surprisingly, this issue is expected to come to a vote shortly in the EEC Parliament, and only the British have indicated they would veto it. Issues like this are appearing with increasing frequency in the debates of the EEC, the deliberations of the United Nations and the economic concessions demanded by the less developed countries.

A second major problem is the recent escalation of credit wars, as industrial countries resort to subsidized financing packages to stimulate exports. Over the past decade, trade officials from major exporting countries have admittedly made some effort to curb the problem through negotiations leading to "gentlemen's agreements" on export credits.

But isn't it a bit naive to assume that countries which depend on trade for 20 to 40% of their gross national product can avoid domestic political pressures that support aggressive export efforts? Won't these pressures make gentlemen's agreements difficult to enforce?

Let me pose an alternative. We might consider establishing a new international export credit agency to enforce common rules on export financing, much as the IMF, supported by its enormous financial resources, oversees international monetary practices. If all major trading nations agreed to abide by the same export credit rules, export financing would no longer be the determining factor in international buy/sell decisions.

Certainly the status quo is not acceptable—the current export credit war is irrational, costly, and leads to serious misallocation of resources. It must be stopped.

The third major problem concerns tax subsidies on export sales. Like export credits, tax subsidies create enormous distortions to international trade. They are particularly insidious because they are so difficult to identify, measure and verify with accuracy.

The industrial countries are wasting an enormous amount of time, energy, and money just to stalemate each other's export subsidies. Shouldn't we devote our efforts instead to reaching an understanding on common standards for export tax relief?

A fourth area of concern is the increasingly predatory manipulation of foreign exchange rates. In 1971, when the U.S. went off the gold standard, the world officially switched from fixed to floating exchange rates. But floating rates have turned out to be more an illusion than a reality—most nations have endeavored to manage their floats very carefully. The manipulation is

not overt but is often hidden in a maze of capital or financial market controls.

Japan, in my judgment, is a prime example. The Japanese have been able to keep the value of the yen artificially low. At present, the yen is trading at the depressed level of about 265 to the dollar, when most experts agree it should be trading between 180 and 200 to the dollar if, in fact, the rate reflected market conditions. This managed float strongly encourages Japanese exports and discourages imports. Not surprisingly, Japan's trade surplus with the United States is expected to reach \$20 billion this year—or almost half America's projected trade deficit with the entire world in 1982.

One possible solution might be to broaden the scope of the International Monetary Fund to include explicit authority over exchange rate manipulation. The fund's member countries could give the IMF the power to impose appropriate sanctions on nations which did not allow their currencies to move freely in response to underlying market forces.

The fifth and last item on my agenda, is the exceedingly tough issue of assuring fair market access. It seems that most countries in the world today hope to export their way to economic salvation. It should be obvious that they cannot all succeed as exporters if no one is willing to be an importer.

The U.S. represents the biggest import market in the world and, by and large, we've made this great asset available to our trading partners with relatively few restrictions. But we're at the point now where we can't continue giving foreign producers unfettered access to our markets unless we gain equivalent access to theirs.

The market barriers American producers face overseas come in many guises. For instance, they may be told their products don't meet local specifications or consumer tastes. Or, they may be told their products don't meet domestic safety standards even if they have passed international standards accepted by the importing country. In other cases, they may have to comply with restrictive licensing requirements or agree to manufacture a certain percentage of their product in the importing country. All of these restrictions severely limit the ability of U.S. companies to penetrate foreign markets.

Japan has been particularly effective in restricting access to its markets. Let me recount the experience of FMC and other American companies in marketing soda ash, the principal ingredient in manufacturing glass. Although U.S. producers of soda ash have had a substantial cost advantage over Japanese producers, they've been restricted for the past 10 years to only 5% of the Japanese market. If U.S. producers could compete head-to-head with the Japanese manufacturers, it's been estimated that they could capture up to 40% of the Japanese soda ash market.

In the case of soda ash, there are no problems with product quality, reliability, or distribution capability—factors which the Japanese have traditionally used to explain the failure of foreign goods to penetrate their markets. Nor is there a problem in meeting specifications for the home market, a requirement Japan often invokes, since soda ash is a commodity chemical with universal properties. It is a clear case of import restrictions to protect Japanese producers.

We're a country that truly believes in open markets and the free entry of goods, but our trading partners must know that we are no longer willing to tolerate one-way streets. Free access to all markets of the

world must be an unending objective as we seek better guidelines for international trade.

In summary: The protection of industrial property rights; an armistice in export credit wars; the elimination of competition in tax subsidies; the control of exchange rate manipulation; and, above all, the assurance of fair access to world markets; are five international trade challenges we must confront successfully during the 1980's.

I opened my remarks by questioning whether GATT is capable of effectively addressing issues as tough as these. By asking the question, I don't mean to suggest the answer is "no," but it is apparent that changes must be made, either within the structure of the GATT or as a supplement to the agreement, to address the changes that have taken place in international trade over the last 35 years.

A drift away from a free trading system could close off the longest ERA of prosperity the world has ever known. But free international trade faces its greatest challenge since World War II, as neither we, nor any other nation, have yet eliminated the lure of protectionist responses to increasingly severe problems.

The stakes are enormous. In my judgment, we must develop broader, more comprehensive guidelines to address the complex realities of international trade today and prepare for the challenges of tomorrow. Just as there is no shortage of challenges, I am confident there will be no shortage of creative solutions.●

A DAY OF SORROW

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, November 7 marked the 65th anniversary of the "October Revolution," the day in which the Russian people were deprived of their liberty by the Bolshevik Communist Party. It is a day of sorrow for the Russian people, Russian Americans, and freedom-loving persons everywhere; but it is also a day that must not be forgotten.

The occasion serves as a grim reminder of the terrible suffering the Russian people have been forced to endure at the hands of the Communist-controlled Soviet Government since 1917.

During my 14 years in Congress, I have joined my colleagues in calling on the Soviet Government to end their constant violations of basic human rights, particularly against their Jewish citizens. Regrettably, these violations continue.

With this in mind, we must use this occasion of the "October Revolution" to renew our commitment to secure basic human rights for the Soviet citizens, and oppressed people everywhere.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I insert an important statement about the "October Revolution," prepared by the Congress of Russian-Americans, Inc., who

are based in my home district in New York:

A DAY OF SORROW

On the 65th anniversary of the "October Revolution", we, as Russian-Americans, wish to remind the Free World that on November 7, 1917 the Bolshevik Communist Party deprived the peoples of Russia of their liberty.

Since that day the Soviet government under the leadership of its Communist Party had continually perpetrated crimes that are an affront to humanity. Among them:

The creation of an Orwellian state founded on a basis of human fear and ignorance and maintained by a ruthless military police;

The "reedification" of the Russian peoples, a policy inaugurated by the heinous murder of the royal family and pursued in the hopes of stripping the Russian peoples of their heritage and thereby creating the ideal human cipher, Homo Sovieticus;

The desecration and destruction of over 50,000 churches and monasteries;

The forcible collectivization of peasants, an act which resulted in the death by starvation of seven million people;

The exploitation of workers and the reduction of peasants to the status of government serfs;

The abandonment of Soviet P.O.W.'s (branded "traitors" by the Soviet regime) in Nazi war camps, resulting in the death of 4,650,000 native sons by starvation and disease;

The forceable repatriation of Soviet citizens remaining in Western European countries after the war and the subsequent imprisonment of these citizens in concentration camps;

The extermination of tens of millions of people in concentration camps and prisons;

The mental and physical torture of countless millions without regard to human rights or dignities;

The military suppression of any popular uprisings within the Soviet Union or any of its satellite nations, particularly Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Poland;

The creation, through the wanton exploitation of natural resources and environment, of an aggressive military machine which continues to grow at the expense of the people's needs and aspirations;

The suppression of the freedoms of religion, thought, speech and the press and the persecution of individuals for their religious convictions and their beliefs in basic human rights.

No document can enumerate the countless crimes perpetrated by the Soviet government against its peoples. Only the tears of an anguished and suffering people can serve to measure these atrocities. To these tears we direct our hopes, our prayers, and our actions.

The 7th of November, the day of pompous Soviet celebrations, parades and deceitful proclamations about the "struggle for peace" and about the "joyous life" of Soviet citizens, we designate as a Day of Sorrow and Irreconcilability.

This Day of Sorrow and Irreconcilability has been faithfully observed by Russian-Americans and by all Free Russians for the past six decades. Throughout all these years Russians free in mind and spirit have continually attempted to warn the Free World of the threatening Communist danger, but to no avail.

Once again, we appeal to the government of the United States of America to proclaim this day as a Day of Sorrow and Irreconcilability and we invite the citizens of this country to join us in prayers for those who perished at the hands of Communism and for the deliverance of those presently living under the yoke of Communism.●

INDIANA'S ECONOMY: I

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit my Washington Report for November 3, 1982 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

INDIANA'S ECONOMY: I

Indiana's economy is in the worst shape I can recall during my service in Congress. Never have Indiana residents expressed to me so frankly and forcefully their concerns about their economic future.

Hoosiers with whom I have spoken want more jobs, lower interest rates, and fewer price increases. I have spent many long hours thinking about these problems and trying to see how to solve them. This newsletter and the one to follow give some of my thoughts on Indiana's economy, its troubles, and the steps we must take to strengthen it.

Everyone recognizes that the health of the national economy has a profound impact on the health of the Hoosier economy. Renewed growth in the national economy is the best thing that could happen to Indiana. However, Hoosiers should not just sit back to see what happens at the national level. There are a number of steps we can take at home, and we should take them as quickly as possible.

In addition to the recession, Indiana's economy has had to cope with long-term structural changes which altered opportunities for employment in its major industries. But the double-digit unemployment and massive dislocation that afflict Indiana and other states in the industrial heartland are neither inevitable nor irreversible. Our state has natural advantages that we can build upon to keep the Hoosier economy vibrant and healthy.

Hoosiers are painfully familiar with our state's current economic predicament. At the start of the 1980's basic manufacturing provided 40 percent of the income earned by the people of Indiana, compared to less than 30 percent for the nation as a whole. Nearly one Hoosier in four worked in the production of durable goods, and four heavy industries—steel, automobiles, machinery and electric equipment—accounted for more than one sixth of our state's employment. But basic manufacturing—the dominant employer in Indiana and a traditional backbone of the Hoosier State's economy—has contracted quite sharply during the recession.

Unemployment in Indiana has ranged from two to three percentage points above the national average. Testimony at congressional hearings I held in Indianapolis indicated that roughly 45,000 Hoosier jobs have been lost in automobile and steel production alone. Even without the hardship of back-to-back recessions, however, these key industries have been weakening. Among other factors, aging plants, government regula-

tion, and the high cost of energy and financing have lessened their ability to meet increasingly stiff competition from abroad.

Neither Indiana nor the nation as a whole can afford to abandon basic manufacturing. We must help basic industry toward recovery. At the same time, we must acknowledge that some of the jobs recently lost in automobile factories and steel mills will never be restored. We must move into new fields of commerce, industry, and trade where the potential for employment and economic growth is strong.

So far, it has been difficult for new, high-technology industries—those producing lasers, semi-conductors, robots and the like—to become firmly established in Indiana. There are, for example, only three robotics firms in Indiana, compared to 17 in Michigan and eight apiece in Ohio and Illinois. The availability of skilled labor is one of the major factors determining where such firms locate.

Indiana has a strong educational base, but it has not achieved its full potential. Hoosiers graduate from high school at a rate above the national average (75.1 percent in Indiana, compared to 73.6 percent nationwide), but only 11 percent of our residents are college graduates, compared to a national average of 13.9 percent. With our first-rate institutions of higher learning, Indiana should have the highly skilled labor force to meet the challenge presented by the new industries; instead, many young, highly skilled workers trained in Indiana have taken jobs elsewhere. We need to encourage our young people to achieve their full educational potential. At the same time, we must insure that people with specialized training do not need to leave our state to find jobs.

There are also steps that we can take to utilize existing manpower and industrial capacity. One of the most important is to improve our public infrastructure. There are 4,700 bridges in Indiana, many of which, like the 45 percent of all bridges throughout the nation, are structurally deficient or functionally obsolete. It is estimated that bad bridges and roads alone cost the private sector \$30 billion per year nationwide in damages and lost business. Water mains, parks, sewer systems, ports, public buildings, and railroads are also in desperate need of repair. Delays in repairing these facilities cost millions of dollars and thousands of jobs each year. Despite budgetary constraints, we can find ways to put our people to work restoring the vital public infrastructure on which all economic growth is ultimately based.

We should take steps to prompt a broad range and wide variety of investments—in education and training, in public infrastructure, in research and development—which would help attract the new, innovative businesses upon which Indiana must rely for future growth. Such investments would clearly complement efforts to improve our position in basic manufacturing as well. We will also need to strengthen cooperative relationships among labor, business, and government, and find more effective means of combining public and private resources for the good of our state.

(Note: In next week's newsletter I will discuss these proposals in more detail. Also, I will make specific recommendations to help solve our state's pressing economic problems.)●

AN AMERICAN CELEBRATES 25 YEARS OF CITIZENSHIP

HON. WILLIAM M. THOMAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has just finished celebrating Thanksgiving, a day when we stop to reflect upon all that we have for which to be grateful. Thanksgiving held special significance this year for one of my constituents, Mr. John Florian of Bakersfield, Calif.

John Florian and his wife recently celebrated their 25th year as citizens of the United States, having fled the Communist regime in Hungary in 1957. I would like to share Mr. Florian's recent letter to me, because I think it is a fine expression of the spirit upon which our Nation was founded. It should also serve to remind each of us that Americans have one thing we can all be grateful for—we have our freedom:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMAS: I am writing to you because my wife and I reached a very cherished anniversary of our life. For twenty five years, we enjoyed freedom and privileged living in this wonderful country.

In September 1957 we came as refugees from Hungary and we were accepted as citizens of this great nation which we proudly call home. This past quarter of a century brought us many happiness and satisfaction both in our family and professional lives.

We cannot think of a more proper way to celebrate than expressing our thanks and gratitude to the American People, and no better way to communicate than through our elected representative.

Thank you America for opening your doors and letting us come and enjoy the freedom and opportunities of this majestic land! Bless the people who have given us the helping hands, so we may do the same for others.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN FLORIAN.●

DAN CRYSTAL, DEFENDER OF CIVIL LIBERTIES

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, for close to a decade, the Judiciary Committee—and the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice in particular—has been the fortunate recipient of the assistance and counsel of Daniel Crystal, the chairperson of New Jersey Coalition to Defend the Bill of Rights.

In our efforts to reform the Federal Criminal Code, for example, Mr. Crystal has been our constructive and most indefatigable critic. In a recent article, Mr. Crystal has detailed a previous instance in which he provided Members of Congress with invaluable help. I be-

lieve that my colleagues may find this article of interest.

[From the Reporter, Spring 1982]

A FOOTNOTE TO HISTORY, OR HOW I HAD A HAND IN THE DISGORGEMENT OF THE PENTAGON PAPERS AND OTHER UNLIKELY EVENTS AND MARVELS

(By Daniel Crystal)

Everyone is writing his or her memoirs these days.

Henry Kissinger has just weighed in with the second volume of his new version of the Arabian Nights in which Air Force One takes the place of the flying carpet. The Watergate conspirators have made zillions of bucks from their books and on the lecture circuit. My Bergen County neighbor, Richard M. Nixon (he's now from Saddle River; I'm downcounty in Saddle Brook) is slithering his way back to respectability as a so-called elder statesman. ("Cry, the Beloved Country" is a useful title to remember).

Its high time then for me to tell Reporter readers of how I once taught a valuable discovery technique to the House of Representatives and at least in my own mind, became a legitimate footnote in history as a result.*

The surprising (but entirely true) tale begins (if anything ever has a real beginning) with the election of Bella Abzug to the House. Her staff had asked a lawyer I know, Morton Stavis, now of Hoboken, to brief her on the intricacies of House parliamentary procedure. He lacked time, having to write a brief for the United States Supreme Court. He asked me to take over. Ignoring the old saying about fools rushing in, I agreed. I obtained a copy of the "Rules of Procedure of the House of Representatives," dutifully looked the rules over, researched reform ideas on Congressional procedure, and in general made myself a Man Friday to Bella. I can't say I learned all that much since much of parliamentary procedure is arcane and unwritten. It reposes in the notes of the House Parliamentarian who, at least then, played ball with the powers that be, and not with those who weren't in the inner circle.

Years loped along, and we suffered the agony of the war in Vietnam. And along the line (1973, if memory is accurate) we began to learn of the secret and horrendous bombing of Cambodia. It will be interesting to read the minuet that Henry Kissinger undoubtedly dances in telling of his part in that massive use of airpower against civilian targets.

Now the story commences.

On one Friday afternoon, just before I was leaving the office for the weekend, the phone rang. It was someone in Bella's office, asking if I could suggest a way to break through the wall of secrecy about the bombing in Cambodia.

I said the honest thing: "I don't know anything offhand, but let me think about it."

I had nothing to go on but the copy of the "Rules of Procedure of the House of Representatives" I had acquired years before. It was (at least then) poorly indexed, perhaps to protect the turf of the House Parliamentarian. In fact, it has two sets of rules in it, one those originally formulated by Thomas Jefferson, the other a more modern set.

* To quote a wise observer of the passing scene, Dorothy Leavy, history always begins on the day of one's birth.

There was, of course, nothing to do but to start fishing the hard way—that is, to read the whole damned, dull book.

About three quarters of the way through that long Friday evening, I recapitulated Archimedes. Fable has it that he said, "Eureka" when he found the answer to a scientific problem. I said, "Aha!"

What I had run across in my methodical reading of the House rules was something called "A Resolution of Inquiry." It's a discovery rule. It provides that the House can pose factual questions to the executive department. I spotted the kicker immediately. If the Cabinet member, President, or other executive department official does not respond and turn over the desired information in seven calendar days, it becomes the privileged business of the House.

"Privileged business!" That means it cuts through the Rules Committee and the other road blocks and parliamentary obstructions barring House action. It's a veritable blockbuster of a rule. It makes possible an end-run around both the Administration and its allies in the House.

Next day, Saturday, I spent at Rutgers Law School Library. Years before, at the time of the March to Selma, Alabama, I had holed up there, researching material for a brief on behalf of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party challenging the right of the Congressional delegation from Mississippi to be seated in view of the racist violation of the voting rights of blacks in that state. That's another yarn for these offbeat memoirs. What's pertinent now is that I had then become familiar with a set of massive books called, "Precedents of the House of Representatives." It had originally come out in 1917 or 1919. There was an annotation and supplement in 1931 or 1933. After that, silence, and ask the help of the House Parliamentarian (if you're a favored member of the Congressional club).

So with that useful knowledge, I hied myself to the law school and xeroxed or photostated the numerous precedents I found when my discovery, the Resolution of Inquiry, had been actually used. It developed later that it had not been used for some forty-one years or so before I rediscovered it that boring night, of now so many years past sleepily reading all the rules of the House of Representatives.

I sent off the envelope of xeroxes to Bella's office with an explanatory letter, and went about my own affairs. In fact, eventually I forgot completely about my foray into Congressional parliamentary procedure. Bella filed a Resolution of Inquiry, but nothing came of it, just then.

Nothing is forever, not even forgetfulness. Time passed, and I received another phone call from Bella's office, once again on a late Friday afternoon.

This one was different, though.

If I could make anything out of this call, I was being congratulated for helping spring the Pentagon Papers loose from Richard M. Nixon.

Pentagon Papers! Me and the Pentagon Papers? The Pentagon Papers and I?

What's going on here? I felt as remote from the Pentagon Papers as I do now from the budget cut planning by the only President we have.

Then memory took over.

I asked if Bella had filed a Resolution of Inquiry.

She had, and that explained it. Nixon had sent the Pentagon Papers to Congress under tight security. Members of Congress could read the Pentagon Papers volumes under

those restrictions. They couldn't get copies, but they could read the actual volumes.

The press was giving Bella credit for ripping the Pentagon Papers loose from Nixon's clutches. And her staff was courteously sharing the credit with me.

It was an unreal feeling of disbelief and pride.

I equaled that quite incredible mood some time later following the impeachment of Nixon and President Gerald Ford's pardon of the man who now is the resident squire of Saddle River. The unprecedented happened. A sitting President came before a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee to answer a Resolution of Inquiry directed at why he had pardoned Richard M. Nixon for high and low crimes, felonies, misdemeanors, and parking tickets.

I had recently had surgery and was convalescing. I sat enthralled, watching the subcommittee hearing on television. And I marveled that I, the third son of Jewish immigrants, Joseph and Jennie Crystal, who had lived with the entire family of eight of us in two rooms behind a Mom-and-Pop grocery store in East Orange, had somehow been able to reach into the Oval Office of the White House and help force a President of the United States to do something he didn't want to do.

Resolutions of Inquiry are used all the time by Congress now. In recent months, a member of President Reagan's cabinet came close to being held in contempt of Congress by defying the House as to information demanded about energy. Like any other rule, all groupings in the House use it now, the right as well as the moderates and the liberals.

What I did was to go into Congress' museum of obsolete weapons, blow the dust off one of them, bow and hand it to the House for modern usage. As any lawyer familiar with interrogatories and depositions would readily know, it works. Somehow, by tedious reading, I had given the House a valuable aid in the constant battle between two co-equal departments of our government, the legislative and the executive. I had resurrected yet another check or balance of the sort we all learned about when we first took civics in junior high school.

That night's solitary reading of the "Rules of Procedure of the House of Representatives" (a soporific volume if ever I drowsed over one) has turned out to be the most important single achievement of mine in the practice of law. It just goes to prove again what powerful instruments for truth are our discovery rules.

Nevertheless, it still feels totally unreal to have ever had anyone link me with the disgorgement of the Pentagon Papers from the grip of that "historian" who has grown accustomed to disgrace. Daniel Ellsberg nearly went to prison because of the Pentagon Papers. Most emphatically, those trying to let the country know about what was going on in Vietnam did not win the favor of Richard M. Nixon, once the peripatetic tenant of Key Biscayne, San Clemente, and 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue in the District of Columbia, and now my near neighbor in Bergen County.

Understandably, we're still not talking to each other.●

THE SOPHISTICATED CRIMINAL

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, today's criminal, are becoming much more sophisticated and, thus, much more dangerous. Of special concern is the increasing criminal use of bullet-resistant vests, similar to those used by police.

In last year's Nyack, N.Y., Brink's robbery, a criminal's vest stopped a police bullet, allowing the robber to return the fire and kill two law enforcement officers.

Other incidents include one of the FBI's most wanted killers, Joseph "Mad Dog" Sullivan, being captured earlier this year wearing a bullet-resistant vest; and two New York City drug dealers, after being arrested, boasting to police that "our vests are better than yours."

In a more recent incident, the New York Daily News reports that two New York City bank robbery suspects "wore bulletproof vests" during a robbery and subsequent shootout with police. One of the vests stopped a police bullet that would have disabled one of the robbers, but instead, both criminals escaped. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert the full text of the New York Daily News article, which discusses the event in further detail:

[From the New York Daily News, Nov. 19, 1982]

BANK-HEIST SUSPECT IN 3-HOUR SIEGE

(By Bernard Rabin and Don Singleton)

A bank robbery suspect with a submachine gun held police and FBI agents at bay yesterday for three hours at a Queens rooming house before surrendering.

Walter Anderson, 21, had been traced by New Rochelle FBI men to 102-35 Remington St. off Liberty Ave. in South Jamaica.

After the agents and Queens detectives asked the landlady if Anderson was there, she called to him, and he yelled: "I'm not coming out! I have a submachine gun and I won't be taken!"

Beginning at 9:15 a.m., the lawmen negotiated with Anderson, who was in a room with a girlfriend, Liza Borden. Hearing a report that he had fragmentation grenades, police evacuated adjoining houses. The rumor was unfounded.

Early in the siege, Anderson swapped a .38-caliber revolver for a pack of cigarettes. Anderson made no demands but said he was reluctant to give himself up for fear of being injured by police.

At 11:55 a.m., with the house surrounded by flak-jacketed cops, Anderson agreed to give up. Agents entered and emerged at 12:03 p.m. with Anderson and Borden. One agent carried Anderson's Uzi submachine gun.

Detective Inspector Roy Richter said Anderson was wanted in four bank robberies in Westchester County.

Richter said Anderson and another suspect, Wayne Glover, had evaded arrest Nov.

1, after a shootout at 175th St. and Walton Ave. in the Bronx. The suspects wore bullet-proof vests, and Anderson's stopped a bullet that would have penetrated his chest, Richter said.

Glover reportedly was captured a few days later.

Anderson was taken to Manhattan Federal Court to await arraignment on charges of holding up the Bank of North America at 928 McLean Ave., Yonkers, on Oct. 13, and the Knickerbocker Savings & Loan Association at 929 McLean Ave. on Oct. 18.

During my 23 years as a New York City police officer, I was wounded 10 times in the line of duty. As a result, much of my work in Congress has been devoted to better protecting the lives of our law enforcement officers. An important part of this effort is insuring that police officers are better equipped than the criminals they are protecting us against.

This means that criminals must not be allowed such easy access to bullet-resistant vests. I have authored two bills that would help in this regard. Specifically, my bills, H.R. 4978 and H.R. 5559, would place tighter controls on those persons selling and buying bullet-resistant vest, and would impose tough new penalties for any person caught wearing a bullet-resistant vest during the commission of a crime.

The prompt and favorable consideration of this legislation is essential to the future well-being of our Nation's 528,000 law enforcement officers.●

BURDEN SHARING

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit my foreign affairs newsletter for October 1982 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article from the newsletter follows:

BURDEN SHARING

One of my impressions from the campaign is that Americans are questioning the burden placed on them by America's role in the world. Why, they ask, should so many of our tax dollars be sent abroad when there are so many needs at home? This newsletter addresses only one aspect of that question: the perception that our allies have not done enough to respond to Soviet militarism. The feeling runs deep in America that we bear too big a share of the burden of defending the West. It made news when a Senate subcommittee voted to cut our troop strength in Europe to its 1980 level.

The issue of burden sharing is not new. In 1950, the original members of NATO agreed to divide the defense burden equitably. In 1966, Senator Mansfield criticized the expense of our troops in Europe and drafted a bill to bring some troops home. In the 1970's, American and European leaders tried to devise a formula to spread the cost of defense. A 1978 accord stated that NATO members would hike their real defense spending by 3 percent annually. With this

formula, it was hoped, NATO would match the Soviet military build-up and Europeans would do more in their own defense.

Americans are concerned about burden sharing for two reasons: the American economy, and allied policies toward the Soviet Union. Confronted with a bigger defense budget and an economy in recession, members of Congress are looking for ways to save money. Some members say that the economies of Western Europe and Japan are stronger than in the 1950's and can now carry more costs. The desire in Europe to expand commercial contact with the Soviet Union is also a problem. Lack of support for all our sanctions against Poland and the Soviet Union has emphasized the difference between the allies and us on the question of how to deal with the Soviet Union. Some Americans wonder why nearly 350,000 troops should be kept in Europe without a firmer European commitment to stronger defenses against the Soviets.

Americans know that the alliance has kept the peace for more than 35 years and still serves our interests. Such an alliance should not be lightly discarded, especially when the alternatives to it are not clear. At present, the Soviet Union is engaged in a massive military expansion, and only through joint effort can the West preserve its security. Americans are also aware that the global duties we have carried since 1945 demand sacrifices. These include high defense costs and the regular stationing of our forces abroad.

Europeans say that a cut in American forces would be a blow to their security and to their confidence in us. They argue that we cannot afford to compromise our own security for short-term financial gain. They cite statistics to show that Europe is pulling its weight. The United States paid 53% of the total allied defense bill in 1980, down from 61% in 1971. During the 1970's, American defense spending decreased by 1% per year while the European members of NATO raised theirs by 2% per year. Many of the allies have the military draft, in part for the alliance, and it skews comparisons of defense budgets since conscripts tend to cost less than volunteers.

Contrasted with these statistics are others which show the extent of America's sacrifice. In 1980, the United States and Greece each spent 5.6% of gross domestic product (GDP) on defense. No other NATO member matched this figure, and Japan spent only 1% of its 1980 GDP on defense. As a percentage of population, we have more men under arms than do any of our allies. Per capita, we spend \$607 per year for defense, compared to NATO's collective average of \$434 and Japan's \$84. Our forces in the Mediterranean Sea and those we have committed to the Persian Gulf protect European sources of oil. They should be counted as part of the cost of defending the allies.

Perhaps the standard by which burden sharing should be judged is the 3% formula established in 1978. Only the United States and Luxembourg have met the goal each year. France has missed it only once. NATO as a whole has raised its defense spending by 2.1% to 2.6% annually. West Germany, the country most central to European security, has increased its defense budget by 2.8% annually during the last decade. Some critics charge that the 3% formula is unrealistic in light of the worldwide recession, but without the formula the ends of the alliance would be harder to achieve.

Western security would not be enhanced if we attempted to settle the issue of burden

sharing by unilaterally bringing forces home. An objective of our foreign policy is to prevent the Soviet Union from decisively influencing Europe, but to reduce our conventional strength in Europe would only mean riskier reliance on nuclear deterrence. Such a move would also undermine negotiations on the mutual withdrawal of Soviet and American forces from Europe. Odd as it seems, the redeployment of our Europe-based troops in America might even add \$17 billion to our defense costs.

The allies say that their troubled economies will not allow them to expand their military establishments substantially. They do have major economic problems, but this fact must not prevent negotiations on burden sharing. Many options exist. For example, the allies could gradually contribute more to the maintenance of our forces within their boundaries. Also, burden sharing would be promoted by a vigorous effort to end duplication and waste in NATO. Talks to encourage the production of more weapons by the allies could advance burden sharing as well. Finally, it does make sense to bring our troops home if Soviet troops are also removed from Europe. At talks in Vienna, NATO itself has proposed to cut ground forces on each side to 700,000, with cuts in American and Soviet ranks before all others.

As it responds to the growing weariness of Americans with global duties, Congress needs to determine which options promote burden sharing and work for a consistent foreign policy toward Europe and Japan. The mixed signals we have sent Europe on the pipeline and grain sales have confused the allies. Without steady leadership from us, agreement on burden sharing cannot be expected. If we and the allies cannot decide how to divide defense costs, only the Soviet Union will benefit.●

**LELAN F. SILLIN, JR. RECIPIENT
OF THE NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL, INC., 1982 DISTINGUISHED
SERVICE AWARD**

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the outstanding accomplishments and contributions of one of my constituents Lelan F. Sillin, Jr., who was chosen as the recipient of the New England Council's 1982 Distinguished Service Award. The New England Council, Inc., a 58-year-old business association representing 1,200 corporations and industries throughout New England has worked assiduously to advance the objectives of the region's business community. Mr. Sillin has been a key element in that effort.

In addition, Mr. Sillin's contributions to the field of energy development and his strong sense of community leadership truly represent the American spirit of enterprise in action. The Council's Distinguished Service Award honored Mr. Sillin for these qualities among many others.

Mr. Sillin, who lives in Lyme, Conn., with his wife Joan and their four chil-

dren, is chairman of the board of trustees and chief executive officer of Northeast Utilities. He also serves as chairman of Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Co.

Mr. Sillin was born in Tampa, Fla., and earned his law degree from the University of Michigan Law School in 1942. In 1969, he received an honorary degree of doctor of laws from Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.

Mr. Sillin began his business career in 1945 with the New York City law firm of Gould & Wilkie as general counsel for Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corp. In 1951, he was named secretary and assistant treasurer of Central Hudson, becoming an assistant general manager in 1953 and elected vice president and a member of the board of directors 2 years later. He was named president in 1960, and became chief executive in 1964.

Mr. Sillin has given his time and energies unstintingly in order to enrich the lives of others. He is a member of the National Leadership Council of ELDERHOSTEL, an independent national nonprofit corporation whose goal is to serve older adults; He is also a member of the National Industrial Advisory Council of Opportunities Industrialization Centers of America, and an active member of the Utilities Publication Committee and director of Public Utilities Reports, Inc.

He serves as well, as a member of the National Advisory Board, Federation of Americans Supporting Science and Technology (FASST).

Prior to Mr. Sillin's current work he served from April 1979 to February 1981 as a member of the Committee on Prevention of Significant Deterioration of Air Quality of the National Research Council's Environmental Studies Board. The board is a unit of the Commission on Natural Resources of the National Research Council, which is the joint operating body of the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering.

Last month, the New England Council, Inc., formally honored Lee Sillin at its board of directors annual dinner in Boston. During these ceremonies several congratulatory telegrams and letters were presented. One, from the president of the American Nuclear Energy Council, John T. Conway, said of Mr. Sillin, "Because of your foresight and courageous actions in the field of energy development, our Nation's security and the well-being of the people of New England will be greatly enhanced during the coming decades."

Indeed, Lelan Sillin, proud son of Connecticut, has earned the praise of his colleagues, as well as the distinguished academic and civic awards granted him over the years. I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the many achievements of Lee Sillin.●

**DEFENSE APPETITES MUST BE
CURBED**

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, near the top of our agenda as we return today must be consideration of the 1983 Defense Department appropriations. During our break for this year's elections, the New York Times printed an able summary by Fred Kaplan of what goes wrong when Congress considers the Nation's defense needs. I draw my colleagues' attention to Mr. Kaplan's comments with the hope that porkbarrel politics and shortsighted cuts in vital military operations and maintenance (O&M) do not overtake this year's DOD bill.

Mr. Kaplan points out that O&M cuts have the attraction of reducing outlays, and therefore the deficit. He notes that even "dovish" Members support defense programs of only parochial merit, and describes the enthusiasm gold-plated strategic gadgetry arouses in Members. In contrast, although it is the area of defense in which we are most deficit, readiness has no outspoken, moneyed lobbies to protect it, and is basically a mundane aspect of defense.

What makes these typical irrationalities of defense politics worse today is the fact that the current administration and especially the Secretary of Defense are not playing their appointed roles as arbiters of the demands of the Joint Chiefs and the legitimate needs of our Armed Forces. Instead, DOD has acceded to virtually every whim of the services, no matter how unnecessary or how out of line with current budget realities. Because the military budget lacks proper oversight at the Department of Defense, Congress must fulfill that responsibility better than is usually the case.

I ask that Fred Kaplan's essay, "Defense Nuts and Bolts" be printed in the RECORD at this point.

DEFENSE NUTS AND BOLTS

(By Fred Kaplan)

WASHINGTON.—President Reagan's defense budget will almost certainly be cut substantially next year. Federal deficits are intolerably high, social programs have been cut to the bone; the new, more liberal 98th Congress will surely insist that the Pentagon start making its share of sacrifices.

However, if Congress behaves in the usual fashion, it is likely that the wrong things will be cut. The burden will fall disproportionately upon spare parts, fuel, ammunition, depot repair and other elements of the operations and maintenance account that comprise "military readiness."

In short, the items that Congress tends to cut most heavily are those that are most essential to fighting a conventional war for longer than a couple of weeks.

In the past year or so, Congress has paid more attention, in rhetoric anyway, to the importance of readiness. Yet it continues to cut still further the one section of the defense budget that is underfunded to begin with. The reason has to do with incentives that lie close to the heart of the legislative system.

First, cutting the production of major weapons yields relatively small savings in immediate outlays. It takes several years to build tanks, missiles, airplanes, ships; only a small fraction of the appropriated money—2 percent in the case of aircraft carriers, about 15 percent for tanks—is actually spent in the first year of outlays.

However, the workaday items of operations and maintenance are used almost right away; a \$1 billion cut in this account produces, on average, an \$850 million saving in first-year outlays. At a time of enormous deficits and demands for quick solutions, this situation makes the readiness account a tempting target.

Second, there really is a military-industrial complex, and Congress is caught in the middle of its workings. Even liberal legislators are often persuaded by arms manufacturers in their districts to preserve otherwise useless weapons programs that mean big money and thousands of jobs for constituents. For example, Alan Cranston, Democrat of California, one of the Senate's leading nuclear-freeze advocates, always votes for the B-1 bomber, manufactured by his home state's Rockwell International Corporation. And if some Congressmen have no such interests to serve, they may need to trade favors on other bills with those who do. By comparison, the makers of spare parts and bullets carry no measurable clout.

Third, to a much greater degree than is casually assumed, Congress still defers to the wisdom of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (who in this Administration also appear to have the Secretary of Defense firmly in their pocket). Even if some members are skeptical of the military's requests for bigger and more expensive weapons, there is no consensus among the 535 individuals and their staffs in Congress for any coherent alternative.

Finally, there is a visceral dimension that few would openly acknowledge but that is very obvious to anyone who has observed relations between Congress and the Pentagon for a while—and that is that big, fancy weapons systems are sexy, while the mundane supplies that keep the weapons operational are not. Few experiences aside from a roller-coaster provide the thrills of watching—or better yet, riding in—an M-1 tank tearing across the countryside at 35 miles per hour (even though it breaks down after a few hours of wear), an F-15 jet zooming at Mach 2 (even if no pilot flies that fast in combat), an Aegis destroyer with dozens of radar-control switches lighting up (even if the radar makes the ship vulnerable to anti-radiation missiles).

On the other hand, reports on depot backlogs, low readiness rates and spare-parts shortfalls tend to be boring.

To the extent that Congress cuts funding for major weapons at all, it usually just stretches out the procurement schedule—thus accomplishing little more than making the weapon still more expensive, because of future inflation, in the end.

A great defense debate has been raging in the news media over fundamental issues concerning weapons procurement: Should we buy small numbers of expensive weapons or a larger number of cheaper, simpler

ones? Since many new weapons have failed miserably in testing, why fund them any further? Is the counterforce strategy that justifies many of the Pentagon's new nuclear missiles prudent or practical?

The story to watch is whether members of the new Congress will be able to overcome the incentives that lead them to dodge such issues, or whether they will continue to slash the essentials and let the bloated parts remain. It may well be that only a President can hope to control the Pentagon's appetite—and Ronald Reagan has not revealed an inclination to do so. ●

PERSONAL TRIBUTE TO VIETNAM VETERANS BY FRANK UMBRO, ARDSLEY, N.Y.

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share with my colleagues a personal tribute by Mr. Frank Umbro of Ardsley, N.Y., to the thousands of American men and women who gave their lives while serving in Vietnam. Mr. Umbro, a veteran himself, served with the 30th Artillery Division in Vietnam from 1967-68, has sent me his own salute, in the form of a poem, to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial dedicated on November 13, 1982.

For the 2.7 million Americans who served and the 57,939 who sacrificed their lives in this unpopular war the "National Salute to Vietnam Veterans," and the Vietnam Veterans Memorial were more than a 5-day tribute and the dedication of another monument. They represent a lasting tribute to the service and dedication of Americans who deserve a place of honor beside the men and women who fought in all America's battles.

The historic week of November 10 to 14, will be remembered for the reading of nearly 58,000 names of those lost forever or missing in Vietnam, shows, vigils, ceremonies, unit reunions, concerts, receptions, a parade, and the culmination of the week with nationwide religious services and prayers, remembering and honoring all those who served in Vietnam. Mr. Umbro's personal salute follows:

"V"

Soon there will be a monument, erected for the children.

Who gave their lives, without question, and didn't choose to run;

For political or whatever reasons, they stayed in their country's name.

And forfeited their freedom, I ask you who's to blame?

Since '68, I've watched each sunrise, and so much time has since elapsed.

Yet every night, I still hear, that mournful sound of "Taps".

For them, I pray in silence, and bid them; rest in peace.

And hope I never again be a part; of war, such a terrible disease.

At last; there will be a monument, standing solemnly in twilight's calm.

A "V" for all the valor, for those who gave their lives in Vietnam.

And for those of us, who came home, a question, come November.

Will you pay your final respects, Will you at least remember?

And you; the unsuspecting, the tourist, from near and far.

Kneel down, and give abundant thanks, for knowing where your children are . . .

—FRANK V. UMBRO. ●

UNITED NATIONS WORLD ASSEMBLY ON AGING

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant events to take place this year on behalf of senior citizens was the first U.N. World Assembly on Aging held in Vienna, Austria between July 26 and August 6. I was proud to have been named by President Reagan to be a member of the U.S. delegation which included the illustrious chairman of the House Select Committee on Aging, CLAUDE PEPPER.

The World Assembly marked the first time in history that governments of the world gathered together to discuss the implications of the aging of society both in the developed and developing world. There are an estimated 300 million people 60 and over in the world today. This number is expected to double by the year 2000 and by that time fully two-thirds of the elderly will be living in the developing nations.

The World Assembly on Aging provided a first time opportunity to discuss the global perspective of aging. It was a frank discussion of how a society responds to its elder members and how that in turn impacts the economic political and social fabric of all societies.

As an original member of the House Select Committee on Aging, I joined with a majority of my colleagues in 1977 in supporting legislation which called for the convening of and U.S. participation in a World Assembly on Aging. The purposes of this meeting were set forth in a 1980 resolution adopted by the United Nations General Assembly.

To focus attention of various governments on issues of aging in designing policies and programs for economic and social development in both developed and developing countries;

To provide an international forum for the exchange of views among governments on the ways and means of dealing with the aging—both legislatively and administratively;

To identify aspects of various issues and consider how nations can cooperatively benefit from collective thinking on these issues; and

To focus attention and encourage wider support for future activities of the United Nations and related organizations in the field of aging.

The U.S. delegation, representing the nation that first advanced the idea of the conference, was composed of a number of notable policymakers, from both the public and private sectors, as well as advocates from the aging network. I wish to commend Secretary Schweiker, as head of the delegation as well as the alternate delegates and advisers who joined the official U.S. party. These delegates included Dorcas Hardy, Assistant Secretary for Human Development Services; Dr. C. Everett Koop, Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Services; Virginia Knauer, Special Assistant to President Reagan; Commissioner on Aging, Dr. Lennie-Marie Tolliver; Chairman of the Federal Council on Aging, Adelaide Attard; Ambassador Roger Kirk of the U.S. Mission to UNIDO, and their advisers. Private sector participants included Constance Armitage, president of the 1981 White House Conference on Aging; Cyril Brickfield, executive director of the American Association of Retired Persons; Eleanor Cain, president of the board of NASUA; George Telisman, president of the board of N4A; and Curt Clinkscales, national director of the National Alliance for Senior Citizens. All these delegates worked extremely hard and were especially effective in presenting our country's position in a unified and articulate fashion.

Preparation by the United States for participation in the WAA was extensive and comprehensive. In early 1981, a Federal Interagency Committee was established, which included Members of Congress, in order to monitor and assess each stage of U.S. participation. Nongovernmental organizations also played a key role in fashioning our position. On an international level, an NGO Committee on Aging was organized in New York in 1977 which regularly sponsors meetings through the U.N. Secretariat and other international aging groups. There is also an NGO Committee on Aging in Vienna which provides for a comprehensive and coordinated approach to international aging issues. On a national level, there are approximately 40 aging organizations with a total membership of 18 million. It is undoubtedly clear that these 18 million citizens have made themselves active allies of the elderly and are critical to policy formulation on Federal, State, and local levels.

THE CALL FOR INTERNATIONAL ACTION

The basic force behind the convening of the WAA is the basic fact that we are growing older as a society and the concurrent acknowledgment that this aging process has major political, social, and economic implications. Statistics best illustrate this point: The

world's total population will increase from about 4.1 billion in 1975 to 6.1 billion in the year 2000—a 49-percent jump. Of this increase, the aged population is expected to grow from 348 million to 590 million—an increase of 70 percent. This increase will be especially pronounced in less developed countries which anticipate that their cumulative populations will double—from 180 million to 360 million. Compare this to developed countries which will experience a 39-percent jump in the same time period, from 166 to 230 million.

Concurrent with the demographics question are the socioeconomic questions that also arise. These issues cover a broad range of issues from health care to housing to education. One of the key roles of the WAA was to identify critical areas of mutual concern and share this information with participants. In a world of ever-diminishing resources, the method by which these resources are allocated and the beneficiaries of these resources must come under close scrutiny. The elderly, which are most often most severely effected by changes in the socioeconomic fabric of a polity, must be assured an adequate standard of living. Just how this standard is and must be addressed in the world of today was a bold and farsighted challenge which was presented to the delegates at the WAA.

The final document adopted by the delegates, known as the Vienna International Plan of Action on Aging was overwhelmingly approved and will be submitted to the United Nations this fall for final approval. The final conference document closely reflected the U.S. goals and initiatives which:

Designated an appropriate intergovernmental body, the ECOSOC Commission for Social Development as responsible for oversight of the adopted plan of action;

Designation of the UN's Administrative Committee on Coordination as the liaison between the UN agencies and those responsible for implementation of the plan;

Designation of the U.N. Center for Social Development in Vienna as the focal point for any followup activities; and

The continuation of the WAA voluntary trust fund to financially support the work of those organizations and individuals who will implement the plan of action through both the public and the private sectors—which will also be encouraged to lend their contributions to the maintenance of the trust fund.

As we assess the success of the U.N. World Assembly on Aging, let me focus on two particular points. The first was the tremendous work performed by Ambassador John McDonald who was the main administrative officer for the delegation but more importantly the inspiration of the group. He has done extensive work with his counterparts from other nations in the months prior to the Assembly and as a result the U.S. delegation was able to

be very productive and was looked to by other delegations to set the tone on policy discussions. Ambassador McDonald is deserving of high praise for his work.

A second point which tarnished the otherwise successful conference were the actions of a group of some 50 nations which attempted to politicize the Assembly through their opposition to Israel. More specifically, delegates from 53 nations staged a walkout from the conference during the speech given by the head of the Israeli delegation. It was so unfortunate to have a nongermane political issue interjected into still another U.N. conference. I considered it an insult to all who came to the conference for the express purpose of trying to improve the lives of the 300 million elderly citizens of the world. I was further dismayed to learn that the conference despite the opposition of the United States did include language in their final document which was critical of Israel and their actions in Lebanon.

The United Nations World Assembly on Aging afforded us an opportunity to reflect with pride on all that this Nation has done with respect to the development of policies to aid the elderly. We are especially sophisticated and advanced in our Federal programs which provide important social and human services to our elderly citizens. Such legislative programs as those under the Older Americans Act provide us with good models for the rest of the world in terms of developing partnerships between different levels of government to insure the provision of services.

The relationships, the dialogs, and the sharing of information between various nations were all beneficial aspects of this World Assembly. This event should be viewed as a catalyst for future and further action by the world community on behalf of its older citizens. What we can better for society today will be the benefit of all of mankind's tomorrow.●

USE OF POTENTIAL AUTO BREAKTHROUGH BY FEDERAL FLEET

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has imposed many responsibilities upon the auto industry in this country. Two major responsibilities are to increase the fuel economy of automobiles to lessen our dependence upon foreign oil, and to

cut the emissions of harmful pollutants which adversely affect the health of the American people. The auto industry has done an admirable job addressing these concerns in the past several years.

Every year different people claim to have invented engines or devices which will enable vehicles to squeeze even more miles out of each gallon of fuel or release even less pollutants from the tailpipe. Inevitably, thorough testing has exposed these inventions as failures.

A new device has been developed in the last 3 years known as the Webster-Heise valve. This valve has been tested by a U.S. EPA-certified laboratory, at the inventor's expense, and has come through with some remarkable results. Cars equipped with this simple device have registered the following advances: Fuel efficiency increases of up to 20 percent; increases in torque—power—of up to 40 percent; reductions in nitrogen oxide emissions of up to 50 percent; reductions in carbon monoxide emissions of up to 45 percent; and reductions in unburned hydrocarbon emissions of up to 13 percent. Furthermore, cars equipped with the valve operated best on 75 octane gasoline.

The Congressional Research Service issued an exhaustive analysis of this test data and has concluded that the device presents the "potential for substantial national benefits in fuel efficiency, reduced dependence on imported oil, improved balance of payments position, and reduced automotive air pollution." Based on this preliminary data and analysis, Congressman MADIGAN and I recommended to Secretary Drew Lewis that the Department of Transportation conduct tests of the Webster-Heise valve. These tests are now ongoing.

Today, Mr. MADIGAN and I are introducing a bill which we feel provides the next logical step in the testing of this device. The bill amends title V of the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act to allow the Administrator of the Government Services Administration, in consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, to require that at least 10 percent of new gasoline-powered cars in the Federal fleet be equipped with the valve. This decision would be based on a finding by the Secretary that there is a substantial likelihood that the valve results in increased fuel efficiency and decreased auto pollutants, based on the ongoing DOT tests.

I do not know if this valve works or not, I only know that test results so far are very promising. I feel that the ongoing DOT tests which I requested along with the program established by this bill will give us a clear answer. If

that answer is affirmative, the positive consequences to the American consumer and the country as a whole could be tremendous.●

THE MOOD OF HOOSIERS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit my Washington Report for October 27, 1982, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE MOOD OF HOOSIERS

A few weeks of intensive visiting with Hoosiers always sharpen my impressions of the things on their minds. A politician is forever trying to catch the mood of his constituents, but that mood, like the wind, is constantly shifting. So I try to monitor it and assess it, testing its direction and force. Measuring the mood of Hoosiers toward government and the economy is, in my view, absolutely critical to the decisions I must make as I vote on legislation and oversee the operation of government. For what they are worth, these are some of my impressions of that mood today.

Several themes are prominent in Hoosiers' thinking. Hoosiers want to reduce the size and cost of government. They want to eliminate waste and fraud in government. They want to cut down federal regulation and red tape. They want to live in a more stable and peaceful world, and they believe that strengthening American military power and launching bold initiatives for peace are essential to that goal. At the same time, they show signs of weariness with the costs and risks of being a world power. In this regard, the size of the foreign aid budget and the danger faced by our Marines in Lebanon are two things which trouble them. Most important of all, Hoosiers want to have a growing economy with jobs for all who need them and low rates of inflation and interest. They recognize that the Hoosier economy is down, but they are holding tight for now and they expect a brighter future.

One of the questions which Hoosiers are wrestling with is the proper role of government. Many of them like the idea of reducing that role, but as specific steps are taken to do so they begin to have second thoughts and they come to think that perhaps the recent budget cuts may be going too far. They have the sense that the scales have been tipped against the average person. Many now say, for example, that cutting spending for social security and pollution control is a misstep, a false economy. Hoosiers reject the excesses of government in the past, but among them the feeling that we may be going from one extreme to the other is growing.

As much as anything else, Hoosiers are seeking a proper balance between government which cuts too much and government which spends too much. They seem to want a lot done, and they accept (even if they are not happy about) the fact that there is no recourse but for government to have some important responsibilities. They also know that big government creates all kinds of

problems. So they want public officials to reshape the institutions of government, improve the capacity of government, and show that governmental systems can work better. They want to be assured that government is an institution worthy of their confidence. They are seeking real changes in the conduct of the public's business, but they do not want radical or revolutionary changes. The mood in favor of limits to government action and retrenchment in government budgets seems strong. My guess is that it is likely to be with us for an extended period of time.

Hoosiers are also interested in a whole set of social issues—more so, I think, than the polls may indicate. Issues such as education, crime, drunk driving, and child abuse are very much on their minds. In education, for example, the question is not only busing and federal funding, but also a demand for discipline and competency in the classroom. On crime and drunk driving, the mood is definitely one in favor of an immediate, uncompromising crackdown. Hoosiers want criminals off the street and drunk drivers off the road—period. I have been impressed by the growing number of people who express a genuine desire for more action on child-related problems—child abuse especially, but also the problem of runaways and missing children.

Everywhere I go in Indiana, people want government to develop a coherent policy to deal with the future. There is a widespread sense that our problems are accumulating, even piling up on us, and that they are not being disposed of efficiently or effectively. Very noticeable among Hoosiers is the wish that government do much more to make the world a safer place to live and work—whether the danger be from poisoned medicines, impure water, muggers, terrorists, or nuclear weapons.

When politicians talk about how complex our problems are, there is, I fear, a note of condescension in their voices. However, Hoosiers know that the world is complicated and that the solutions to problems are not easy to come by, but they really do not expect politicians to perform miracles. At the same time, Hoosiers are saying that adjustments are necessary and that staying put will only get the country into deeper trouble. They are quite prepared, even willing, to endure some temporary pain if they believe that the pain will help us reach our long-term goals. The question for politicians, of course, is what and how much temporary pain people are willing to bear.

When he comments on foreign affairs, many a Hoosier will say that he really cannot abide the thought that United States is being pushed around in the world, whether by friend or foe. Just as often, however, he will volunteer his opinion that it is unwise to allow so much international tension to build up. I have been struck by Hoosiers' uneasiness with moves which increase international tension. They want their leaders to be assertive, but not bellicose, in the conduct of foreign policy. Hoosiers invariably favor initiatives which enhance chances for stability and peace.

All this is written with some sense of tentativeness. The more I study and deal with the public mood, the more reluctant I am to conclude that people are demanding a particular action and the more certain I am that whatever the mood today, it will probably be slightly different tomorrow.●

CONGRESS, THE PRESIDENCY,
AND FOREIGN POLICY

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues will be interested to learn that on November 9-10, a 2-day symposium on "The Congress, the President, and Foreign Policy" was held at the Ford Presidential Library in Ann Arbor. Although it was not possible for me to accept the invitation to participate, I have had the opportunity to review the remarks of Dr. Walter W. Rostow, who addressed the panelists at a dinner hosted by the University of Michigan. As a historian, experienced public servant, and adviser to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, Dr. Rostow speaks with authority on the role of Congress and the Presidency in the foreign policy arena, an issue particularly timely today in the midst of remembering the Vietnam war and the controversies surrounding its conduct, the aftermath of its legacies, and the sacrifices made by hundreds of thousands of the young Americans involved in it. I commend his cogent observations to all my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats alike, for we all bear a heavy measure of responsibility to promote bipartisanship in the formulation of foreign policy.

I would like to add a word about the foreign policy seminar at the Ford Presidential Library, cosponsored by the Gerald R. Ford Foundation; the Association of Former Members of Congress, the 600-member congressional alumni organization; the Atlantic Council; and the University of Michigan. A group of distinguished public servants and scholars participated in the panel discussions, including three former Secretaries of State. Their deliberations initiated a 2-year study by former Members of Congress and the Atlantic Council to explore, in depth, the interrelationships between the executive and legislative branches in all matters of foreign policy-making. Those who will be working on the project possess a great reservoir of practical experience in the political and governmental affairs of the United States, and I look forward to the results of their research. Their perceptions and subsequent recommendations promise to make a substantial, constructive contribution, not only to the work of all of us here in the Congress, but to a clearer public understanding of the problems.

Dr. Rostow's remarks follow:

FOREIGN POLICY: THE PRESIDENT, CONGRESS,
AND PUBLIC OPINION

A few days ago I suddenly recalled, while in the office of the Dean of the LBJ School of Public Affairs—who happens to be my wife—that I was committed to speak here

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

tonight. I turned to the Dean and asked if she had some books on her shelves on the subject of this symposium. Without a word she began to collect and deliver one armload of books after another until I said: "Thanks; enough." Among others in the pile were Morison, Bemis, Bailey, Spanier and Nogee, Crabb and Holt—even the report of a 1979 joint LBJ School and Library symposium on the Presidency and the Congress. As I refreshed my memory of the accumulated wisdom on this well-worked but still elusive subject, I was struck by the following passage from the lead article in *Foreign Affairs* for the spring of 1979, which was also included in the Dean's pile and underlined in red: "... I confess to increasingly serious misgivings about the ability of the Congress to play a constructive role in our foreign relations." The author: J. William Fulbright.

There is a good deal to be said for the distinguished Senator's retrospective skepticism. In fact, there were times when I wished he, as an active Senator, had accepted this dictum. We all know that the Constitution is written so as to focus the attention of Congress on their districts and states and, therefore, on local public opinion. We all know that Congress is a diffuse and changing body. There are experienced and wise members of Congress, with a knowledge of foreign affairs to match any in the Executive Branch. Presidents should and often do seek their views; but advice is different from responsibility. Collectively, Congress can, at certain moments, act and, even, act decisively in foreign policy; but there is no continuing locus of responsibility. Moreover, the Congress can change its view on an issue of foreign policy, responding to the swings of public opinion, in a way denied to the President. Above all, Congress can, if it wishes, avoid acting on a problem, leaving the burden of action and political risk to the President.

Wilbur Mills, for example, captured the relationship well at a meeting at the LBJ Ranch early in 1968. President Johnson was asking the leadership for prompt legislative action on a controversial balance of payments measure. At the end, Mills delivered his negative response in the following words: "Mr. President, you sure have my sympathy. You've got more troubles than a dog has fleas." On this matter, clearly, the fleas were going to be Lyndon Johnson's, not Wilbur Mills'. And that's a part of what a President is paid for. The Constitution is so written that foreign policy is inescapably the President's problem; whereas the members of Congress, after consultation, can return to the Hill and leave it to the man occupying 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

Having been involved in the business of the Executive Branch, in one way or another, on and off since the summer of 1941, I wish I could, on this occasion, accept the Fulbright Doctrine and make a straightforward case for a Presidential monopoly in foreign affairs, but neither my knowledge as an historian, nor my experience as a public servant, nor, above all, the dictates of the Constitution permit me to do so. Constructive or not, the Constitution mandates an important role for Congress in foreign affairs; and, in the end, I am sure the Founding Fathers were wise in this as in other matters.

So I am back where, I suspect, you have been since this symposium started this morning: trying to sort out the patterns and lessons to be drawn from 194 years of Executive-Congressional relations in foreign policy: years of quiet, of occasional sturdy

partnership, and of stormy contention—never more stormy, incidentally, than in the first quarter century of the nation's constitutional life.

II

In preparing these brief remarks, I made four lists:

Examples of constructive Congressional initiatives in foreign policy;

Examples of constructive partnership between Congress and the Executive Branch;

Examples of costly contention between Congress and the Executive Branch; and

Examples of essentially unilateral presidential action in which Congress acquiesced without major opposition.

The first is a short but not trivial list. And I am pleased to note, given my initial quotation, that on any such list one would have to place the Fulbright Fellowships. Of greater constitutional interest is the role of certain Senators, in the late 1950's, in breaking a kind of schizophrenic deadlock within the Executive Branch on the question of development assistance to Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, and Asia. There was a stand-off within the Administration between supporters and opponents of development aid from 1953 forward which, for whatever reasons, President Eisenhower was not prepared firmly to settle. In the late 1950's a group of Senators of both parties took a series of initiatives, of which the Kennedy-Cooper resolutions of 1958-1959 on aid to the Indian subcontinent are a good example. As John Kennedy said on March 25, 1958: "There is no visible political glory for either party in coming to the aid of India. . . ." Nevertheless, his and other enterprises went forward. They not only permitted Eisenhower and Dulles to support the Development Loan Fund but also to respond positively to a series of crises in 1958 in Latin America and elsewhere. The creation of the Inter-American Development Bank and the World Bank's International Development Association were among the fruits of this period.

There are no doubt other examples; but I did not wish to leave Fulbright's somewhat self-flagellating dictum unchallenged.

III

As for effective partnerships—my second list—there have been a good many and they are worth recalling and studying carefully.

The collaboration of a series of Presidents with key Senators in the other party to achieve the creation of the United Nations, support for the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan, NATO, SHAPE, and, most recently, the more controversial passage of the Panama Canal treaties.

There was also the collaboration of President Eisenhower with Senator Lyndon Johnson, which, I heard Eisenhower explain to Johnson in the summer of 1968, was a necessary condition for conducting a "civilized foreign policy" in his time of responsibility.

A number of Senators, at considerable risk, and President Ford performed that function with respect to the Panama Canal Treaties.

The role of Senators Vandenberg, Dirksen, Johnson, and others who helped unite the Executive Branch, the Congress, and the nation at critical moments is a proud aspect of our Constitutional history.

At this point I would simply note that the key to success in all such ventures in Presidential-Congressional collaboration was the rallying of public opinion—and opinion leaders—by full and effective presentation of

the facts. Senator Vandenberg's statement of February 27, 1947, to President Truman of the conditions for supporting the Truman Doctrine is the prototype. He demanded: "... a message to Congress and an explanation to the American people, in which the grim facts of the larger situation should be laid publicly on the line as they had been at their meeting that day." Let me recall that Truman's popularity at the time was low; he was generally regarded as a lame duck; Vandenberg was judged to be a quite likely successor; but Vandenberg was wise enough to understand that only the blunt laying of the facts before the people by the President would permit Vandenberg to carry the Senate and Congress in support of what the nation then required. In short, the successes hinged on making the triangle that links the President and Congress work—the crucial third side being public opinion.

IV

Now my third list: the failures of Presidential-Congressional collaboration. There are more than we would wish, but I will cite only three.

Wilson's failure to carry the Senate on the Versailles Treaty and entrance into the League of Nations.

Franklin Roosevelt's failure to persuade the Congress and the people to abandon isolationism until Hitler controlled the European continent and the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor.

The division between Presidents Nixon and Ford and the Congress over policy toward Southeast Asia in 1973-75 leading to the unilateral Congressional destruction of South Vietnamese military capabilities and morale by radical reductions in the military aid promised by President Nixon to the South Vietnamese government as a condition for acquiescence in the terms of the 1973 agreement.

Merely to evoke these painful episodes is to recall how complex the issues in contention can become. There is Wilson's peculiar personality and style and Henry Cabot Lodge's, as well; there is the disabused interwar interpretation by the Congress and the people of the First World War—an interpretation that played a significant part in the process that led to the Second World War; and, of course, as President Ford's memoir and all other evidence make clear, there is the interweaving of Watergate and the weakening of the Presidency with the destruction by Congress of the peace agreement of 1973, painfully earned, over more than eight years, with the blood of South Vietnamese, Americans, Australians, Koreans, and others who supported the purposes of the Southeast Asia Treaty. (I have stated the nature of the tragedy of 1973-1975 as I feel it; but the tragedy is equally real for those who believed or came to believe we had no business making strategic commitments to Southeast Asia in the first place and that Congress rescued the nation from a costly and misguided policy.)

Before characterizing the nature of these failures, let me give some examples from my fourth list—major unilateral presidential initiatives that occurred with Congressional acclaim or without great or protracted controversy: the Berlin airlift; President Eisenhower's Open Skies proposal of 1955; the Cuba missile crisis; the U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic in 1965; President

Nixon's opening to China; President Carter's negotiation of the Camp David Accords.

The reason for the relative success of these initiatives is, of course, that they had substantial majority support in public opinion. They either appeared to move the world in the direction of peace, or they dealt with a potential source of military conflict without significant bloodshed and promptly.

Here, I believe, is the clue to the cases of tragic failure—my third category—and to the essential nature of the relations of President and Congress in foreign policy. The failures are all cases where public opinion was a key variable. The Presidents either failed to sustain public support or could not do so because there was no lucid, deeply-rooted concept of the nation's abiding interests on the world scene to see the nation through a protracted crisis.

Wilson did not explain our declaration of war in 1917 as necessary to protect the nation's abiding interest in avoiding hostile control of the Atlantic and in maintaining a favorable balance of power on the European continent. He held up a transcendent vision of a world made safe for democracy—an admirable vision but beyond the capacity of the United States to achieve. By the time the battle over the Versailles Treaty occurred, it was clear to the American people that, League of Nations or not, it was going to be, still, a pretty ugly world; and a revolution began that persisted and even gathered strength in the 1930's. Democratic liberals like Harry Hopkins converged with Republican conservatives like former President Hoover to argue, with overwhelming majority support in public opinion, that we could and should keep out of the conflict of the 1930's raging in Asia and obviously about to break out in Europe. The eloquence of one of our most popular and persuasive presidents could neither evoke U.S. action to try to prevent the coming war nor, even, prepare the nation to defend itself.

With respect to Southeast Asia in 1975—despite overwhelming support for the Manila Treaty two decades earlier—there was no solid understanding in the Congress or public opinion of why seven successive presidents, from Franklin Roosevelt to Gerald Ford, had made or reaffirmed serious strategic commitments to Southeast Asia. (With President Carter's and President Reagan's reaffirmation of the application of the Southeast Asia Treaty to Thailand, the number is now nine.) The opening to China and apparent détente with the Soviet Union converged with Watergate and other forces to lead Congress and a popular majority to believe that, without significant cost to the national interest, we could turn South Vietnam over to the Communists.

I conclude much in the vein of President Washington's Farewell Address, after eight years when he tried to protect the interests of a young country with no lucid or stable sense of its national interest. Almost two centuries later, the major conflicts between the President and the Congress in foreign policy are still the consequence of a lack of stable consensus in our society on the national interest. With respect to Europe and the European balance of power, perhaps something of a consensus has been achieved and institutionalized; although the consensus is periodically challenged and cannot be taken for granted. And we have three times reacted strongly to reestablish, after going slack, what we hoped was an adequate military balance with the Soviet Union—after

the invasion of South Korea in June 1950; after the Soviet launching of Sputnik in October 1957; and in the wake of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. But, by and large, the behavior of the U.S. in foreign policy in this century has conformed to Dr. Samuel Johnson's dictum: "Depend upon it, Sir, when a man knows he is to be hanged in a fortnight, it concentrates his mind wonderfully." We have oscillated between isolationism, indifference, wishful thinking and complacency, on the one hand, and, on the other, the panic-stricken retrieval of situations already advanced in dangerous deterioration. We recognized our national interest only when we faced real and present danger—a rather dangerous habit in a nuclear age.

That is roughly what Alexis de Tocqueville, writing a century and a half ago, said we would do. And that oscillation explains, I believe, a high proportion—not all—of the tensions between the President and the Congress in foreign policy. By and large—without higher intellect or virtue and with some exceptions—Presidents have perceived the national interest in a steadier way than public opinion or a Congress mandated by the Constitution to be attentive and sensitive to public opinion.

The remedy for this dangerous cyclical behavior, to the extent there is a remedy, clearly lies in a sustained effort by our political leaders to develop a wide bipartisan consensus on the nature of the nation's abiding interests on the world scene—an effort not rendered easier because there is an ideological strand embedded within us which would deny that we, like other nations, have abiding interests.

V

That is about all I have time for tonight except for a final reflection. We can hope that our society evolves a more mature and stable notion of its relation to the rest of the world; and we can all try to contribute to the emergence of a more stable, forehanded consensus. But we shall still need from time to time, I suspect, the exercise by our Presidents of a little noted extra-constitutional dimension of our political life.

The White House is, in a good sense, a haunted house. The family quarters are cheerful and, indeed, modest by standards of other homes of heads of state. All the presidents since John Adams lived there—Adams for only a few months. Lincoln slept and ran the war from what is now known as the Lincoln Bedroom. It is hard for a President in that house to escape a living sense of his predecessors and successors. He knows that his predecessors often left office defeated—and, if not defeated, with the mob howling at their heels, as did President Washington. Often this was because they did what they deeply believed was the right but unpopular thing for the country. Presidents are and should be politicians, and they don't like to be unpopular; but they also wish to be worthy of the best in their predecessors and to be respected by their successors.

From, say, John Adams' determination to avoid war with France at the cost of the possibility of his re-election, down through Harry Truman's firing of Douglas MacArthur and Lyndon Johnson's stoic pursuit of a cautious and unpopular strategy in Southeast Asia to Gerald Ford's response to the Mayaguez incident in the midst of a political mood that simply wanted Southeast Asia to disappear from the face of the earth, we have needed that kind of lonely, unilateral

¹ J. M. Jones, "The Fifteen Weeks," New York: Viking, 1955, p. 142.

courage by our Presidents. We shall continue to need it. ●

AMERICAN GATHERING OF JEWISH HOLOCAUST SURVIVORS NOVEMBER MASS REGISTRATION MONTH

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, in June 1981, the World Gathering of Jewish Holocaust Survivors was held in Israel. No one who witnessed the ceremonies at Yad Vashem will forget the poignancy of the memorial services which brought together survivors from all parts of the world. United by their experiences and remembrances of lost loved ones, they were joined by dignitaries from throughout the world in paying homage to the victims of Nazi tyranny. Those who viewed the event on television or read the newspaper accounts were similarly moved.

November has been designated as American Gathering of Jewish Holocaust Survivors Month, to mark the beginning of mass registration for the American gathering which will be held in Washington, D.C., in April 1983. An outgrowth of last year's world gathering, it will mark the 40th anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising.

Led by the President of the United States ceremonies will take place at the Lincoln Memorial, at Arlington National Cemetery, and at the site of the planned Holocaust Museum and Memorial. It will also mark the first national meeting of Our Children, the second generation of survivors. The gathering will host delegations from Israel and other countries who have pledged themselves to keep alive forever the memory of the fighters and martyrs of the Holocaust and to remain a unified force in the ongoing battle against anti-Semitism.

The Southern California Council of Post-War Jewish Organizations, Survivors of the Nazi Holocaust has been in the forefront of the national movement for the establishment of the newly formed American Gathering. Approximately 20 percent of all survivors in America reside in southern California.

On the national executive committee, the Southland is represented by Irving Peters of Los Angeles, a national vice president, Fred Diamant, and a number of other community leaders. Ben Meed of New York is national president. Elie Wiesel, who also serves as chairman of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, is honorary president.

I ask the Members to join me in recognizing November as American Gathering of Jewish Holocaust Survivors Month, as the mass registration begins for this historic event. ●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JACK BROOKS BEFORE THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the Texas State Legislature has passed a resolution regarding the importance of maintaining a strong commitment to the Nation's elderly on both the State and Federal levels. The resolution reflects my own views and, I believe, those of other concerned legislators that we not forget the accomplishments and contributions the elderly have made to this great society. Now more than ever, with economic conditions and this administration's budget cuts threatening the very livelihood of these citizens, we must maintain our commitment to providing our senior citizens the support and opportunity to live in comfort and security. I am pleased to insert the resolution into the RECORD for the Members to read.

The resolution follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Whereas, the number of elderly persons in Texas is growing rapidly; the 1980 census reflects more than 1.9 million Texans age 60 and older, and the total is projected to increase to more than 3 million by the year 2000; and

Whereas, the quality of life of senior citizens is very important, and insofar as possible, the aging should be able to enjoy within their own families and communities a life of fulfillment, health, security, and contentment and should be appreciated as an integral part of society; and

Whereas, the great majority of these persons are able to live full and useful lives. For some, however, advancing age brings increasing dependence on their families, communities, and governments. Older people in this society should be able to participate in the full continuum of community life in order to enhance their physical and mental health; and

Whereas, complex issues require a working partnership among individuals, families, communities, volunteers, private enterprise, and government to plan for the most efficient and effective use of resources from every sector to meet the needs of our elderly population; and

Whereas, being part of the work force is conducive to better mental and physical health, and appropriate opportunities for obtaining financial stability, through employment, public or private subsidies, or other forms of assistance pension plans, should be fostered for the elderly; and

Whereas, senior citizens in Texas have undertaken to help themselves by means of a statewide network of area agencies on aging sponsored by regional councils, local governments, and private nonprofit organizations through programs administered and supported by the Texas Department on Aging; and

Whereas, improper nutrition is recognized as an acute problem among the elderly, with many older persons being unable to afford quality food for well-balanced diets or lack-

November 29, 1982

ing mobility or incentive to prepare nutritious meals; and

Whereas, proper nutrition is an essential component of good health and is essential for people to live productive, meaningful, and independent lives; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Texas House of Representatives, (the Senate concurring), That the 67th Legislature, 3rd Called Session, commend all components of the Texas State Aging Network for their outstanding efforts on behalf of the elderly; and, be it further

Resolved, That the 67th Legislature recommend that meeting the needs of older persons be a continuing legislative commitment; and, be it further

Resolved, That the Texas Legislature hereby respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to give priority consideration to providing adequate funding to maintain and strengthen comprehensive and coordinated services for the elderly citizens of our nation, particularly those services providing adequate and proper nutrition; and, be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be prepared and forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, and all members of the Texas delegation to the Congress with the request that this resolution be officially entered in the Congressional Record as a memorial to the Congress of the United States of America. ●

IMMIGRATION REFORM AND CONTROL ACT

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, November 12, 1982, the Poughkeepsie Journal published an editorial concerning H.R. 6514, the Immigration Reform and Control Act. The House Judiciary Committee has worked very hard on this legislation, a similar version of which has passed the Senate, and I urge my colleagues to support the committee's efforts to enact this vital immigration measure into law this year. There are many deserving bills waiting to be debated on the floor of the House, but few affect the basic structure of our society as much as H.R. 6514.

I would like to bring the editorial to the attention of my colleagues to demonstrate the importance of the bill and the notice it has received not only in Washington, but in local communities throughout the United States.

The editorial follows:

ALIENS AND THE LAW

Last August, the United States Senate had the good sense to adopt the Immigration Reform and Control Act by the overwhelming, bipartisan vote of 80 to 19. The House of Representatives is scheduled to vote on the bill when Congress reconvenes later this month.

The House bill is essentially the same as the one adopted by the Senate—with one notable exception. That exception—which

addresses welfare benefits available to certain illegal aliens—could severely undermine the bill's effectiveness and could cost American taxpayers billions of dollars. It ought to be dropped from the House bill.

The authors of both versions of the bill recognize that the government has neither the inclination nor the manpower to locate, uproot and deport millions of illegal aliens already living here. Most provisions in both bills are aimed at stopping future illegal immigration by imposing stiff sanctions against employers who knowingly hire illegal aliens.

Both bills permit illegal aliens who have been here for more than five years to apply for permanent resident status, and both provide for temporary status for those who immigrated here in the last five years. Law-abiding immigrants who hold jobs and conform to other standards would eventually be given permanent legal status.

The Senate version of the bill excludes aliens placed on temporary status from receiving aid through such federal welfare programs as food and Medicaid. The bill does provide block grants to states for medical care and other emergency services for these immigrants on a case-by-case basis.

The House bill goes much farther—too far, in fact. It provides federal money for all state and local welfare programs for all immigrants who are granted temporary resident status.

The Justice Department has estimated that the House version of the bill could cost an extra \$4 billion over the next three years. In addition, we believe, it would encourage others to immigrate here illegally. Illegal aliens should not automatically be entitled to the same welfare benefits as legal aliens or American citizens.

Before the House votes on the immigration bill, we urge House leaders to amend it to conform with the Senate version.●

TRIBUTE TO CECIL E. MACKINNON

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, Flint, Mich. lost one of its most unforgettable native sons on November 5 with the passing away of Cecil E. MacKinnon. He lived his entire 81 years there, spending much of that time in sharing his delight with life and his sense of fun and neighborliness.

He becomes widely known for his sense of humor, his pride in the history of Flint and his gift of time in helping others. This concern showed itself especially at this time of year when it is customary for the Salvation Army to sponsor a Tree of Lights. He was chairman for 20 years.

Never having lost the child's anticipation for Christmas morning, Cecil MacKinnon worked and urged others to give so that every light on the Tree of Lights could glow. When he saw the light on top of the tree go on, he knew that many children would awaken to a fine Christmas.

He was Flint's Tom Sawyer in many ways: Boy and man. As a redheaded

boy singing in the choir while his mother played the organ, he would respond to the sound of horses' hooves, and fire wagon bells, and often disappear from the choir loft to follow. He hung around the fire station until they showed him the door, but the day came when they honored him with a Fire Chief's honorary badge and named him "Fire Buff of the Year."

A teller of tales about the old days, he passed along the colorful events of Flint's early 1900's. He became a recognized historian, one to whom people could go for bits of information, whether they were students writing compositions or city officials in need of reliable data.

He used his longtime knowledge of the city to follow a phase of history usually overlooked—the naming of streets and avenues. He made a study of city directories and collected the small details that enrich local history in hopes of publishing a book on Flint's streets.

Through his interest and efforts, a fine, old marble fountain that once stood in the center of downtown Flint was brought out of retirement and placed in a park. A plaque inscribed with his name is evidence of his contribution.

Honors came, one after another: The Hands of Mercy Award from the Salvation Army, the Liberty Bell Award for community achievement from the Genesee County Bar Association, the Heritage Award from the Genesee County Historical Society, and Florist of the Year Award from others in his own profession.

Cecil MacKinnon will be missed by his family, his friends, and his community. Far into the future, when Flint's Tree of Lights shines brightly, people will think of him when the topmost light begins to glow.●

TAXING UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS—AN IDEA WHOSE TIME ALMOST CAME BUT NOW SEEMS TO HAVE WENT

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the Thanksgiving holiday was rudely interrupted for millions of Americans when news reports surfaced that the administration was contemplating a new tax on unemployment benefits. The flap has subsided somewhat by virtue of the President's statements disassociating himself from the recommendations of an administration task force which included a new tax on all unemployment benefits as compared to current law which makes benefits tax exempt for those with incomes under \$12,000, individual, and \$18,000, family.

As a senior member of the House Education and Labor Committee I wish to state my absolute opposition to any taxation of unemployment benefits beyond what is provided for under current law. To subject the unemployed to a tax on their weekly benefits is to make these unfortunate Americans double jeopardy victims of our recessed economy. We cannot overlook the fact that millions of Americans have become unemployed as a result of the failure of the President's economic policies. To then subject their means of existence to a new tax is to compound their victimization.

In practical terms, the average weekly unemployment benefit is less than \$115 a week. In many home State of New York for the first 6 months of this year the benefit level was a mere \$102.64 a week. At what level would we tax these benefits? What basic item of existence would an unemployed worker or their family have to give up to pay this tax?

Further, one of the main rationales for this proposal was that it would help to provide some \$2 billion in new revenues which could be used to fund a new job training program. There are several fallacies associated with this idea not the least of which is the fact that job training is not employment. This administration seems to place great faith in job training initiatives as the means to reduce unemployment. However it is one thing to train people for work, it is something entirely different to actually find employment. The recession we are in is discouraging employers in the private sector from hiring. Further, it should be noted that many of those unemployed today have already been trained and in fact are skilled workers in their own right. Their problem was economic hard times caused their business or factory or industry to scale back their work force. These people do not need new training—they need their old jobs back or to be placed in a new job where their already acquired skills can be used.

I am pleased that this latest administration economic trial balloon was shot down by an outraged public. One assumes that it will not be refloated later but I am confident that if it is Congress will take steps to oppose any such initiative.

As we begin this lameduck session of Congress let us concentrate our resources on getting the tragic double-digit unemployment rate lowered. Let us strive to improve the quality of life for the millions who today are victims of the recession. Let us not compound their miseries with ill-timed and ill-conceived proposals such as the biggest Thanksgiving turkey of 1982—the unemployment benefit tax proposal.●

**JULIUS WILE SONS & CO.
OPPOSES SHIPPING ACT OF 1982**

HON. RAYMOND J. McGRATH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by Harry G. Smith, general traffic manager of Julius Wile Sons & Co., Inc., to correct an apparent misunderstanding of the firm's position on H.R. 4374, the Shipping Act of 1982.

During the September 13 debate on H.R. 4374, a list of firms supporting the legislation was inserted in the RECORD on page H6904. Julius Wile Sons & Co. is listed as supporting the measure when, in fact, it opposed passage.

I insert in the RECORD at this point a letter I received from Mr. Smith on November 2, together with several attachments to that letter.

JULIUS WILE SONS & CO., INC.,
Lake Success, N.Y., November 2, 1982.
Re H.R. 4374.

HON. RAY McGRATH,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. McGRATH: The Congressional Record—House dated September 13, 1982, shows that Julius Wile Sons & Co., Inc. supported the above captioned bill.

This is an error and I am attaching copies of my letters and telegrams in opposition to same as follows:

1. Letter to Honorable Drew Lewis, DOT, dated April 27;
2. Telegram to Honorable Peter W. Rodino, Jr., dated April 29;
3. Telegram to Honorable Mario Biaggi dated May 6;
4. Telegrams to Honorable Paul N. McCloskey, William Carney, Carroll Hubbard, Jr., William J. Hughes, Gene Snyder, Edwin Forsythe, Norman Lent, dated May 6;
5. Letter to Honorable Paul N. McCloskey, Jr., dated June 16;
6. Letter to Honorable Paul N. McCloskey, Jr., dated August 10;
7. Letters to Honorable William Carney, Peter W. Rodino, Jr., William J. Hughes, Hamilton Fish, Jr., Mario Biaggi, Edwin B. Forsythe, Norman F. Lent, dated July 16.

I also attach copies of my letters dated July 13 to Senators Alfonse M. D'Amato and Daniel Patrick Moynihan regarding S. 1593, the Senate version of H.R. 5374, urging that this bill not be passed.

In addition, I telephoned your office and voiced my opposition to H.R. 4374 and asked that you vote against it.

Would you please see to it that a correction is made in the RECORD indicating that Julius Wile Sons & Co., Inc. opposed H.R. 4374.

Very truly yours,
JULIUS WILE SONS & CO., INC.,
HARRY G. SMITH,
General Traffic Manager.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

APRIL 27, 1982.

Re S. 1593; H.R. 4374.
HON. DREW LEWIS,
Secretary of Transportation,
Department of Transportation,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LEWIS: The purpose of this letter is to register our support of S. 1593 and opposition to H.R. 4374 with regard to conferences and shippers' councils.

We feel that open conferences with loyalty contracts and the right of independent action is more than enough for the conference members to insure their survival. We believe closed conferences would enable members to maintain whatever rates suited them in good times and bad legally protected through statute.

Shippers' councils have not been previously permitted in the United States, however, we see ourselves at a distinct disadvantage in negotiating with conferences. We are a small shipper and have a small voice at the bargaining table. We do not feel there would be any negotiating with the conferences but rather they would dictate the rate.

Shippers' councils may also prove to be ineffective in negotiating with the conferences but at least we would be subject to the same ground rules as they and we would be allowed to bargain collectively.

We trust you will take our position into consideration.

Very truly yours,
JULIUS WILE SONS & CO.,
INC.,
HARRY G. SMITH,
General Traffic Manager.

LAKE SUCCESS, N.Y. May 6, 1982.

Re H.R. 4374.
HON. MARIO BIAGGI, CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.,
WILLIAM J. HUGHES, GENE SNYDER, EDWIN
FORSYTHE, NORMAN LENT, WILLIAM
CARNEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.
Hand Del.

We believe that the exclusion of shippers' councils in this bill, while granting wide antitrust immunity to the carriers, is unfair and will put us at a distinct disadvantage in negotiating rates and service with them. Provisions to allow shippers' councils should be made part of the bill.

JULIUS WILE SONS & CO.,
INC.,
HARRY G. SMITH, JR.,
General Traffic Manager.
JUNE 16, 1982.

Re H.R. 4374.
Hon. Paul N. McCloskey, Jr.,
Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee,
Congress of the United States, House of
Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. McCLOSKEY: Thank you for your letter of June 4, with attachments regarding the above and requesting our views.

In brief I would advise that:

1. It stifles competition through expanded anti-trust immunity and permits closed conferences, pooling arrangements, allotment of ports and sailings, regulates the volume and character of cargo, engagement in exclusive, preferential or cooperative working arrangements, enter into other arrangements to control, regulate or prevent competition.

2. It does not provide for shippers' councils which we believe is essential, if we are not to be thrown to the complete mercy of the carriers.

Hopefully you will be successful in amending this bill to permit shippers' councils and

November 29, 1982

bring it more in line with S. 1592 which we find more palatable.

Very truly yours,
JULIUS WILE SONS & CO.,
INC.,
HARRY G. SMITH, JR.,
General Traffic Manager.●

U.N. PROCLAMATION

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month my home city of Newton, Mass., commemorated United Nations Day in a ceremony in the city hall. The city issued a proclamation that reaffirmed strong support for the founding principles of the United Nations—international peace, human rights, economic and social cooperation—but also recognized the serious problems that have occurred within the United Nations in recent years.

I support the proclamation made by the city of Newton and I wish to share it with my colleagues. The goals of the United Nations are exemplary. We must give serious thought however, to some of the negative occurrences in the United Nations and consider how we as a nation ought to respond.

The proclamation follows:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, United Nations Day is designated by the U.N. General Assembly each year to commemorate the founding of the Organization on October 24, 1945; and

Whereas, on this occasion, we join with the peoples of the world in reaffirming our commitment to the principles upon which the U.N. was founded: international peace and security, respect for human rights, and the promotion of social and economic cooperation among nations. United Nations Day also gives us the opportunity to examine our involvement in the world's problems and their solutions; and

Whereas, since the U.N. was founded 37 years ago, the world has changed dramatically, with the addition of more than 100 nations to its membership. In this global community, it is clear that the power to solve the world's problems no longer lies solely in the hands of a few nations. Instead all nations must work together to relieve the suffering of millions, to halt nuclear proliferation, and to promote economic development; and

Whereas, The United Nations recently has become mired in political infighting and has been unable or unwilling to fulfill its role as peacemaker; and has in fact ignored areas of the world in which war and the deprivation of human rights is a daily reality while engaging in diatribes against the United States and its allies for problems caused by other member nations;

Now, therefore, I, Theodore D. Mann, Mayor of the City of Newton, do hereby declare October 24, 1982 as "United Nations Day" and urge all citizens to support the restoration and reaffirmation of the principles and ideals for which the United Nations was created and until which time as that occurs, to consider carefully whether or not

the United Nations, as it is today, merits our continued support.

THE MESSAGE OF THE 1982 ELECTION

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, November 17, 1982, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE MESSAGE OF THE 1982 ELECTION—I

The strongest message of the 1982 election, at least to this politician, is that the voters want the economy straightened out. They want policies which will stop the disastrous rise in unemployment and set the country on the path toward stable, non-inflationary growth.

One way to view the election result is as a grand compromise, with the voters calling for a new political partnership to address the country's economic problems. The preservation of the Senate's Republican majority ensures that the President's domestic objectives will get priority, but the enhanced Democratic House majority opens those objectives to compromise and modification. The ambiguous result certainly improves the competitiveness of American politics.

In many respects, the election amounted to a solid success for the Democrats. By winning seven governorships (despite the loss of California's), the Democrats increased the number of statehouses under their control from 27 to 34. They now have both houses of the legislature in 34 states. They picked up 26 seats in the House, going from 241 to 267, but they were held to no gain in the Senate.

Behind all the numbers, a few facts stand out. The Republicans held the Senate. They lost heavily in the House and even more heavily in the states. In fact, the Democrats' strengthened position in state and local governments may be one of the more important outcomes of the election because of the base it will give the Democrats in 1984. However, neither side felt smug about the result. The Republicans saw that the people continue to like the President, but they also saw that some real doubts about the President's economic program are being openly expressed. The Democrats' win was not as impressive as it might have been. Voters were clearly unhappy—even angry. The recession prompted two of every five of them to say that unemployment was the main problem. Other issues were dwarfed by the question of joblessness. The fact that the Democrats did not do better may mean that the people believe the Democrats have no easy solution to the nation's economic problems.

The Democrats' gains at the state and local levels almost wiped out Republican efforts, underway for several years, to rebuild at the grass roots. Only a few short months ago, the Republicans were viewing 1982 as a realigning election: they planned to add to their margin in the Senate, seize control of the House, and rout the Democrats in a number of states. It is no exaggeration to say that the hopes for a new Republican era, fed by the successes of 1980, have been set back. The President must be assessing the damage done to his economic program. He must also be plotting a strategy to main-

tain his momentum. He will have to work harder to get his initiatives through Congress in 1983 and 1984.

The President's aura of invincibility has been dispelled by the election. Legislators are now more likely to be independent of him, and considerations of political survival will dictate a new congressional receptivity to changes in economic policy. In the months to come, the challenge for the President will be to forestall a stalemate of government while showing flexibility in grappling with the issues. The challenge for Congress will be to display a willingness to work with the President while mustering the discipline to lift the country out of recession.

The Democrats must now formulate alternatives to the present economic course. In the campaign, they often talked about a "mid-course correction" without really suggesting what they meant. When they do define their alternatives more clearly, they will emphasize the creation of jobs.

Campaign rhetoric always tends toward the dramatic but fortunately the voters are wise enough to discount the politicians' inclination to overstate issues. I do not mean to make light of the very real choices of policy that the voters make in an election. The point is that differences among candidates and parties are sometimes to be found on the margins. Despite the partisan sparring, no sharp shift in policies of taxing and spending is likely even though there will be some adjustment.

The election did not show me an electorate that is committed to an ideology. Instead, I see an electorate that wants results. I believe that the political pendulum has swung back to the broad center. There has been no victory for either the extreme right or the extreme left. The American instinct for moderation has expressed itself once again. Also, I do not think that Americans voted to stay the course, nor do I think that they rejected the President or embraced the Democrats. The election revealed few clear trends: it shed little light on steps to be taken to deal with deficits, unemployment, or social security.

It is apparent that there will have to be some bending on the part of both parties. I hope that the election will force the President and Congress into constructive compromises. These compromises should include a cutback in the President's huge increases in military spending, adjustments in the entitlement programs (including social security), efforts to create jobs, and some modification of the tax cuts to reduce the deficit that now looms ahead. Another area of compromise may be the President's drive for new federalism. With the Democrats controlling two thirds of the statehouses, it is unlikely that governors and state legislators will be ready to take on extra functions without additional sources of revenue.

Political commentators have already said that the election gives us a choice between deadlock and compromise. If that is the choice, the wiser course by far would be to negotiate out our differences in an effort to reach a compromise. The President should extend his hand in bipartisan cooperation now, and the Democrats should take him up on his offer.●

FOREIGN TRADE PRACTICES PUTTING AMERICANS OUT OF WORK

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, I have received an excellent letter from my good friend and constituent, Mr. B. B. Forristall, of Mayfield, Ky. Bash Forristall has written to me concerning a most important issue, our Nation's international trade policies. Indeed, his comments concerning our foreign trade practices and the unfair competitive edge that face our American workers are timely and worthy of consideration. The Congress must take the appropriate actions to alleviate the burdens facing our American workers. I believe my colleagues will be interested in Mr. Forristall's letter, and I would like to share it with them at this time. The letter follows:

MAYFIELD, KY.
October 26, 1982.

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD,
2244 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CARROLL: This is to confirm our recent conversation, primarily on the subject of U.S. international trade. As International Product Manager for the Mayfield based Ingersoll-Rand Centac Compressor Division, I have become increasingly frustrated when because of the strength of the U.S. dollar, high U.S. interest rates, and the export practices of our major foreign competitors and their parent nations; to protect our market share and income as a multi-national producer of large industrial air compressors, we have been diverting business to a sister operation in Milan, Italy. In the past year to my knowledge at least \$2 million worth of complete machine orders have been so diverted which in prior years would have been manufactured in Mayfield. Conservatively estimated this would have meant at least 10 more jobs on the local payroll, not to mention the benefits of their wages to the community.

The enclosed article from the Paducah Sun (Oct. 18) concerning Caterpillar Tractor's loss of foreign market share is just another example of the problems almost all major American machinery manufacturers are faced with today. And its costing a lot of Americans their jobs.

It is not the fault of MNC managers for such policies because their own survival depends on Worldwide results for a nation that grew and prospered from strong export trading policies from colonial days until after W.W. II it is a sad state of affairs, when many of our basic industrial products are no longer economically exportable. We practically give away some of our state of the art technology for foreign nations to build and sell to whom ever they please, and permit ourselves to be a dumping ground for the products of not only developing nations but also some developed countries. Sure, some of the dumpers get slapped on the wrist now and then, and there is much talk about import limitations on products such as automobiles. These are not solutions. American needs a comprehensive Interna-

tional Export Program that would permit us to export manufactured products on equal terms with our major foreign competitors. That is not to say that we should accept orders below cost as our Japanese competitors will do in slack times. But we should have access to low interest funds and preferential taxation on export products.

There is considerable evidence that many American workers in industries facing strong foreign competition, now recognize they cannot afford to price themselves out of the market, and that product quality is an essential ingredient for success. The severe adversary positions of American labor, management, and government of past years now seems to be mellowing a bit. Our social systems can never be expected to be blessed with underlying harmony that exists between Japanese labor, management, and government; or the strong ethnic pride of the Germans. Except for occasional rhetorical bombasts their bottom line is invariably what is best for our nation.

As for Japan, I should know. I lived and worked with them for two years recently. As individuals I respect them, but as a nation behind many false faces exists a very devious and cunning foe.

With improving labor-management relations and more supportive government export policies, it will certainly put more Americans back to work.

Sincerely yours,

BASH FORRISTALL.

TO REVIEW FINDINGS OF SLAYINGS IN MIRACLE VALLEY, ARIZ.

HON. GUS SAVAGE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I hope that my colleagues who are not already familiar with the situation in Miracle Valley, Ariz., will take a few minutes to read the following statement that I am inserting into the Record today.

In this statement, Rev. Jesse L. Jackson explains that he, along with a delegation of ministers from the State of Arizona, intend to review the findings of the slayings that took place there on October 23, in the hopes that, through increased public awareness of this incident, an impartial and full-scale investigation will be ordered.

I wholeheartedly support Reverend Jackson's efforts to restore harmony to this torn Arizona community, and applaud his continuing efforts for justice and peace. I sincerely hope my colleagues will also lend support to this cause.

STATEMENT OF REV. JESSE L. JACKSON AND DELEGATE OF MINISTERS, NOVEMBER 10, 1982 TO REVIEW FINDINGS OF MIRACLE VALLEY SLAYINGS

A. WHY HAS PUSH COME TO ARIZONA?

PUSH has come to Arizona because a respected and concerned group of Ministers and citizens in this State have come together across denominational and political lines and asked for our assistance relative to a problem in Miracle Valley, Arizona. Gover-

nor Bruce Babbitt has also asked for our help.

PUSH and our team of ministers will attempt to reduce unnecessary tension where possible. We will also attempt to eliminate unfounded fears and reverse the atmosphere of hysteria by discussing the facts and the issues surrounding the Miracle Valley Church situation in a civil, but straightforward manner. We are willing to mediate, attempt to reconcile and to establish or re-establish lines of communications where that will be helpful and where we can. However, my role is not that of mediator, but of advocate. Fundamentally, I am a human and civil rights advocate.

Thus, we come to Arizona seeking justice and peace, not merely quiet. Quiet is the absence of noise, but a lasting and genuine peace requires the presence of justice.

B. WHAT DO WE HOPE TO ACCOMPLISH?

1. PUSH wants to end the community-church confrontation in Miracle Valley.

2. We want to get a first hand look at the situation in Miracle Valley and the surrounding circumstances.

3. We want to bring greater public attention, awareness, so as to insure that a full-scale impartial investigation into the incident of October 23rd and those leading up to October 23rd are fully investigated by state and federal investigation teams. We also urge that the investigative arm of the press do all it can to reveal all it can about the situation.

4. We want to make a determination of under what circumstances and with what guarantees members of the Miracle Valley church can return to the property that they own and have the human and civil rights of all concerns protected.

5. We want to insure that the Religious liberty and the free practice of one's religion is preserved and protected.

6. We want to insure that the orderly, but fair processes of the judicial order proceed so as to provide "equal protection" and "due process" for all involved.

C. WHAT HAVE WE DONE SO FAR?

1. We have seen television footage of some of the surrounding events at Miracle Valley on Saturday, October 23rd, involving October 23 situation.

2. Several hundred still pictures.

3. We have talked with Pastor Frances Thomas and members of the Miracle Valley Church before and after our visit to Miracle Valley.

4. We have talked with the lawyers representing the two persons who were shot on October 23rd.

5. We have talked with Governor Bruce Babbitt by phone and in person.

6. We have talked with you—William Bradford Reynolds at the Justice Department.

7. We have talked with the leaders of Ministerial Associations around the country.

D. WHAT ARE THE KNOWN FACTS SO FAR?

1. Two black men are dead, two were wounded, two sheriff's police were wounded. Many more church members and officials were injured.

2. Ten blacks are in jail with bail set at \$68,500 each—which appears to be excessive.

3. The judge has limited the lawyers fees for the two men who were shot to \$7,500 and has excluded transportation expenses from Chicago to Tucson. On Monday, it is our understanding that he will seek to have these lawyers dismissed from the case.

4. The coroner's report is in apparent contradiction with eyewitness accounts as

well as the report of the mortician who attended to the two bodies i.e., both men were shot in the back not in the front. Gus Tate shot three or four times in the back. Other shot

E. WHAT IS OUR SCHEDULE OF ACTIVITIES FOR THURSDAY?

1. 8:00 a.m.—9:15 a.m. Breakfast meeting with local ministers. Rev. Warren H. Stewart, pastor, First Institutional Baptist Church, 1141 East Jefferson (602) 258-1998.

2. 9:30 a.m.—Meeting with Governor Babbitt at State Capital followed by a Press Conference. Shared information, pictures. News media projected group as extraneous, religious cult not unlike Jim Jones and People Temple in Guyana. The group led by a charismatic Frances Thomas, not an on live denomination. However, to have read or watched news accounts after shooting, one got impression this was a secluded, religiously fanatical, armed and dangerous group of people.

3. 11:00 a.m.—Depart for Sierra Vista.

4. 1:30 p.m.—Arrive Miracle Valley.

5. 1:30 p.m.—Return to Sierra Vista for flight to Tucson.

6. 2:30 p.m.—Arrive Tucson/Reverend Jackson and Governor Babbitt. Marriott Hotel, 180 West Broadway, Tucson, Ariz. (602) 624-8711.

7. 7:00 p.m.—Meeting with Arizona Baptist Convention. Mt. Calvary Baptist Church, 210 Lester Street, Rev. T. Ellsworth Gantt, pastor.

POLICY STATEMENT ON NUCLEAR WAR

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, the issue of nuclear war remains the most critical issue facing our country today and I am very pleased that the voters of my State, Massachusetts, adopted a nuclear weapons freeze on the November 2 ballot. Many individuals and groups within Massachusetts contributed to the nuclear freeze campaign and one such group is the Massachusetts Health Council. The council adopted a resolution in support of the nuclear weapons freeze and I wish to share that resolution with my colleagues.

The resolution follows:

POLICY STATEMENT OF NUCLEAR WAR

Whereas the Massachusetts Health Council, Inc. believes that the threat of nuclear war is a danger to the health of the citizens of the Commonwealth; and

Whereas the Massachusetts Health Council, Inc. believes that the prevention of nuclear war should be a primary concern of all health care providers and other members of the general public; and

Whereas the Massachusetts Health Council, Inc. believes that a comprehensive freeze by all countries on the testing, production and deployment of nuclear weapons is in the best interest of all mankind; and

Whereas the Massachusetts Health Council, Inc. believes that nuclear weapons should eventually be banned;

Be it resolved, That the Massachusetts Health Council, Inc. recommends that its member organizations and individual members join the Council in speaking out on the dangers and threat of nuclear war, against nuclear weapons and their use by any country including the USSR and that the Massachusetts Health Council, Inc. will inform its state and national elected representatives of its position in favor of increasing the effort to end the risk of nuclear war. ●

JAMES WEBB ON VIETNAM VETERANS

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, Veterans Day was very special this year, as the Vietnam veteran moved front and center in long-delayed national recognition. A part of this included the dedication of a new and controversial monument on the Washington Mall.

The views I most respect have been expressed by Vietnam veterans such as Tom Carhart and James Webb. Mr. Webb was interviewed by the Washington Times November 12 and his comments deserve thoughtful study by my colleagues.

[From the Washington Times, Nov. 12, 1982]

WEBB SAYS VETS HAVE PRIDE, NEED RESPECT—INTERVIEW

VIETNAM VETERAN AND AUTHOR JAMES WEBB ON THE WAR, THE MEMORIAL AND THE CONTROVERSY

About 250,000 Vietnam veterans are expected to gather here this week to celebrate Veterans Day and to participate in a belated National Salute to Vietnam Veterans. One of the highlights of the five-day event is the American Legion-sponsored dedication Saturday of the controversial Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Constitution Gardens near the Lincoln Memorial.

A principal leader of thought and action behind the memorial is James Webb. In 1979, Webb was the recipient of the American Legion National Commanders Public Relations Award—given to the one person each year who best epitomizes the Legion's view of service to God and country.

Webb graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy in 1968. He served as a Marine rifle platoon and company commander in Vietnam, where he was wounded twice, and was one of the most highly decorated Marines of that war. After earning a law degree at the Georgetown University Law Center, he served as minority counsel to the House Committee on Veterans affairs, and was one of the principal contenders for the position of administrator of veterans affairs when President Reagan took office. He also has taught courses on poetry and the novel at the college level, and has written numerous articles and two books, including the widely acclaimed "Fields of Fire" and "A Sense of Honor." He now is writing full time to finish his third novel, which will be released next year by Doubleday Publishers.

Webb was interviewed yesterday—Veterans Day—by Washington Times Deputy Op-Ed Editor Charlie Wheeler.

Question. Yesterday was Veterans Day. Do you believe such celebrations still have meaning in our society?

Answer. Of course they do. I believe that every indicator shows that the American people hold the men and women who have served their country, particularly during wartime, in the highest esteem. For instance, in the most comprehensive survey done on attitudes of and toward Vietnam veterans—the Harris Survey commissioned by the Veterans Administration and published in June 1980—those surveyed placed Vietnam POWs at 10 on a scale of one to 10, and those who served "in country" at a 9.8. Those who opposed the war were somewhat around a five, and those who went to Canada were down around a three.

And veterans themselves retain a great deal of pride in their service. That same survey revealed that 91 percent of our combat veterans were proud they have served their country, that 74 percent actually enjoyed their time in the military, and that two out of three would do it again, even given the outcome of the war. These are figures from Vietnam. I'm sure figures from other wars would be comparable.

I'd like to emphasize something. This is Veterans Day. We have rightly become concerned about the lack of dignity that was accorded our Vietnam veterans, and I'm delighted to see the attention they are now receiving. But there are about 30 million veterans in this country today, and I feel deeply appreciative to every one of them who served honorably. My father flew bombers in World War II. My father-in-law was one ridge down when they planted the flag on Iwo Jima. They never failed to honor and appreciate what we did in Vietnam. I never saw a generation gap when I came home; I saw a culture gap within my own generation. I honor their service. I'll never forget them. That's what this day is all about.

Question. Tomorrow the controversial Vietnam Veterans Memorial will be dedicated. Vietnam veterans from around the nation are expected to attend and participate in a parade and the dedication itself. Are people going to come? How do the veterans feel about the dedication and these events?

Answer. The problem with the events of this week is that we are asking veterans, and particularly Vietnam veterans, to rally around a negative symbol when they dedicate this memorial. I would rather wait to see the reaction of those who have served when they see the wall before I speak too broadly, but every indication I have had, including my own admitted bias, is that this is not an appropriate symbol of honor and recognition.

Question. I suppose we should clarify for the record that you were involved in the Memorial project, first as an initial member of the National Sponsoring Committee and later as a vocal opponent of the winning design. You speak of indications other than your own feelings. What are they?

Answer. Some of them are purely visceral and subjective, others are more demonstrative. I travel a good deal, and over the past year have talked to hundreds of combat veterans. The reaction is overwhelmingly negative, to the point of tears and unmutated anger. It is as if the black walls are a continual insult, as powerful as the flag-burning demonstrations during the war. That may not be fair, and it may not even be logical. But we forget that art is metaphorical. It creates symbols that people react to. Public

art, particularly that which is dedicated to a political event, is unavoidably political in itself. And when someone designs a black gash of earth with the names of the dead tossed upon it in no particularly recognizable manner, the symbolism hits you in the gut. And you get mad.

The more objective things are the Gallup survey done for Ross Perot, which the Memorial Fund participated in preparing, and which has been covered in your newspaper already. It showed overwhelmingly negative feelings. One of the most striking figures is that only 18 percent of the respondents believed that Vietnam veterans would like the Memorial. And this wasn't an insignificant survey—324 former POWs responded. In the \$6 million Harris Survey I mentioned earlier, which represents a comprehensive panorama of Vietnam veterans, only 1,176 men were interviewed. The reason a follow-up survey of all Vietnam veterans, rather than the POWs, wasn't done by Perot is that the Memorial Fund agreed to the compromise which allowed a statue and a flag to be placed prominently on the site.

Question. Which isn't being done?

Answer. Which, I hope, will be done. The Fine Arts Commission and the Department of Interior appear to be in a stalemate right now. Perhaps we need an exit poll at the dedication, to gauge once and for all the feelings of the subject class. I hope that will happen. The most important thing isn't my feelings or the Memorial Fund's, or any one individual's. The important thing is to get it right for the people who served. They've been dumped on long enough.

The most incisive comment I've heard came from Al Santoli, a former enlisted soldier, wounded three times—who wrote "Everything We Had." He said, "This isn't a Memorial. It's a place to go and be depressed. Harvard and Yale gave us the war, they avoided fighting it, and now they are trying to tell us what we are supposed to like for a Memorial."

Question. You were recently quoted in Newsweek to the effect that reactions to the Memorial constitute a "Rorschach test for attitudes toward the Vietnam war." Are we ever going to get over Vietnam? What needs to happen in this society before we can move on?

Answer. We'll never "get over" Vietnam any more than we've gotten over the Civil War, or any more than a person gets over a death or a divorce. It will always be there. The most important thing is to try and assimilate it, to try to come to grips with the way it changes us as a society. The first, and most difficult hurdle to overcome, is to recognize that for many people, the loss of the war was not a defeat. It was a victory.

I'll never forget when the movie "Hearts and Minds" won an Academy award for best documentary, its producers rather delightfully read a congratulatory telegram from the Vietnamese Communist delegation in Paris. The people who supported the North Vietnamese effort to subjugate the South have a lot to live with right now, and it must make them extremely uncomfortable. They made a mistake. There was no "pure flame" of revolution in the South. We have to admit that, rather than ignore it.

We blew it in Vietnam, but not in the manner the anti-war movement was suggesting. I am not trying to point a finger. The time for recrimination has passed. But honesty is the first step toward resolution, so let's be honest.

Question. So, who lost the Vietnam war?

Answer. The political apparatus of our country, which first never articulated our mission clearly enough, causing the distress that became the anti-war movement, and second could not keep its fingers out of the day-to-day conduct of the war.

I believe that Lyndon Johnson created a scenario which made the war a disaster, particularly in the way he conducted the air war in the North. We sent pilots on ridiculous targets, creating the illusion that the North Vietnamese could withstand American airpower, while never using our strategic aircraft for their proper purpose until 1972.

On the ground, the United States military was never defeated on the battlefield, even in one major engagement. That's not revisionism, it's the truth. The North Vietnamese themselves have admitted to losing at least 600,000 men. In ratio terms, that's the equivalent of 6 million Americans. We did our job, under enormously difficult conditions, sometimes including the lack of appreciation of our own countrymen. I'm very proud of the men I served under, with and over. Again, that's what this week is about.

Question. Your age group was deeply divided by Vietnam—some say permanently. What do you say to the people who opposed the war?

Answer. This is a multicultural society. On any moral issue we're going to be in a state of abrasion. I have no quarrel with those who dissent on political issues in this country. That freedom is the wonder of this country. But let's be honest about what happened, not so we can decide who was right and who was wrong, but so we can learn and grow. The real bottom line is this: There are things in this world worth dying for, and if you don't believe that, you deserve to live as a slave.●

JEWISH WAR VETERANS ADOPT RESOLUTION CONDEMNING RISE IN ANTISEMITIC VIOLENCE AND VANDALISM

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, at their 87th annual convention, the Jewish War Veterans adopted an important resolution which merits the close consideration of my colleagues.

The resolution discusses the very disturbing rise in the reported cases of anti-Semitic violence and vandalism in this Nation. It is a problem which has more than doubled over the past 2 years.

In February of 1981, I introduced H.R. 2085, a bill to impose stiff new Federal penalties for acts of religious violence or vandalism as well as those attempts at such acts as well as those intended to infringe upon a person's right to free exercise of religious beliefs. Despite the proliferation of this problem the bill continues to languish in the House Judiciary Committee.

No one level of government should be expected to bear the entire responsibility for solving this problem. On the other side of the coin neither

should all levels of government avoid taking action on the problem. A partnership of purpose is needed to end the wanton destruction of sacred houses of worship and religious articles within—a partnership of purpose must be formed to keep religious figures from being assaulted and beaten. This partnership of purpose must be developed within each level of government and done so quickly. In the words of Edmund Burke "All that is necessary for evil to triumph is for good men to do nothing."

At this point in the RECORD I wish to insert a summary of the Jewish War Veterans resolution pertaining to anti-Semitism.

ANTI-SEMITISM IN THE UNITED STATES

JWV believes that the recent rise of "hate" groups and the increase of vandalism dictate American vigilance against anti-Semitism and other forms of bigotry. JWV reaffirms its commitment to actively confront all "hate" groups and to join with other ethnic, racial and religious groups in the battle to combat anti-Semitism and racism through education, civic and action programs. JWV also supports legislation to increase penalties for religious and ethnic connected vandalism.●

NUCLEAR WASTE LEGISLATION

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, on September 30, the Washington Post published a column on nuclear waste legislation by Mary McGrory which made rather egregious errors of fact.

To keep the record straight on this important bill, whose consideration resumes today, I am submitting the letter I sent to the Post correcting Ms. McGrory's errors. While our Capital's leading newspaper did not believe the letter merited publication, I am pleased to see it included in the RECORD for my colleagues to judge.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., October 1, 1982.

LETTERS EDITOR,
Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR OR MADAM: Mary McGrory's column of September 30 contains serious errors of fact which undermine her ad hominem attack on the nuclear waste legislation pending in the House.

First, she implies that the public would have to bear the burden of financing interim storage of civilian plants' nuclear waste before completion of a permanent repository, by stating "taxpayers" would have to "take over the 40-to-50 year burden. . . ." In fact, the bill provides that interim storage would be entirely financed by the nuclear utility industry so that no Federal tax dollars would be used.

An even more egregious error is Ms. McGrory's assertion that certain language inserted in the Senate bill by Senator McClure would preempt a State from chal-

lenging the designation of a permanent waste site in its territory. The phrase quoted is merely a statement of justification for the legislation and is completely separate and apart from the provisions for a State's challenge to the siting of a permanent repository.

In fact, the House legislation provides for full State consultation in each step of the process for the siting and construction of a permanent waste repository, as well as for the use of facilities within a State for interim storage. Most importantly, the bill allows a State to veto the choice of a permanent waste repository, subject to an override by Congress. Curiously, Ms. McGrory's devotion to the principle of States' rights, which heretofore has been kept from her readers, now surfaces in connection with legislation she opposes.

Finally, the "rush to judgment" which Ms. McGrory protests so passionately follows the consideration of nuclear waste legislation since 1976. In 1980, both the House and Senate passed bills, but were unable to resolve their differences before the end of the session. The 1982 House bill, sponsored by Mo Udall, John Dingell, Dick Ottinger, Don Fuqua, Manny Lujan, Marilyn Bouquard, Beverly Byron, Carlos Moorhead and myself, is a consensus developed after 18 months of good faith compromises and action by 5 major Committees representing over 160 Members.

On May 10 of this year, the Post, in its lead editorial, urged the necessity of nuclear waste legislation, stating, "All but the most diehard opponents of nuclear power agree on one thing—the industry desperately needs a waste disposal plan." After the failures of recent years, the Post continued, "It would be a tragedy for Congress to fail again." Ironically, the delay in bringing this year's bill to the Floor in large measure is attributable to the efforts of proponents of legislation to accommodate the interests of all affected parties, most especially State governments. Had Ms. McGrory taken the trouble to study the issue, she could have given her readers some of the hard facts instead of facile emotionalism.

Sincerely,
JAMES T. BROYHILL,
Ranking Minority Member,
Committee on Energy and Commerce.●

TEXTILE WEEK

HON. TONY COELHO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, during our recent recess, the week of October 17-24 was observed as "Textile Week," a period set aside to recognize the importance of one of our most basic and essential industries.

Even though textiles touch our lives every day with literally thousands of products for consumers, few people realize the economic importance of this industry to our entire Nation.

The textile industry is extremely important to my home State of California, providing 14,000 jobs directly and supporting another 107,000 in the related apparel industry. In addition, 45,000 cotton farmers and more than

6,000 woolgrowers are dependent on the textile industry.

Nationally, the fiber-textile-apparel complex provides some 2 million jobs—1 of every 9 in manufacturing—forming our largest industrial complex.

The United States depends on textile products for clothing, home furnishings, transportation, industrial products, defense, health care, space exploration, and recreation.

Textiles have helped make ours the highest standard of living in the world. Americans consume in an average year nearly 60 pounds of textiles per person. That is about twice the amount used in Western Europe and as much as 10 times that used in other countries of the world.

Americans spend almost \$100 billion for clothing alone.

Other major uses of textile products include towels and sheets and curtains, carpets and upholstery. They also are used extensively for medical dressings and surgical sutures, fish nets and filters. Our Armed Forces use some 25,000 different textile items from rifle slings to bulletproof vests and pontoon bridges and parachutes.

Today, the United States has the most productive textile industry in the world and while productivity in American industry in general has declined in recent years, the textile industry has actually increased its productivity 4 percent a year over the past decade.

Although we sometimes take our textile industry for granted, it is one of our most vital national resources.●

NUCLEAR WAR IN WELLESLEY

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, unquestionably the growing movement in the United States today to halt the nuclear arms race is a credit to our Nation's citizens who have taken the lead—ahead of the elected officials in many cases—to show beyond any doubt the terrible implications of a nuclear war. One such example of this effort is the booklet prepared by the Wellesley Committee for a Nuclear Weapons Freeze in Wellesley, Mass. I wish to share large parts of this booklet with my colleagues because it is an example of what concerned citizens can do when they realize that the only solution to the nuclear weapons issue is to prevent a nuclear war.

I commend the following booklet to my colleagues:

NUCLEAR WAR IN WELLESLEY

"One day both sides will have to meet at the conference table with the understanding that the era of armaments has ended, and the human race must conform its actions to this truth or die."

Dwight D. Eisenhower letter—1965.

This booklet has been prepared by: The Wellesley Committee for a Nuclear Weapons Freeze, Post Office Box 2000, Wellesley, Massachusetts 02181.

This Committee is a Wellesley group of about 150 townspeople, non-partisan and non-sectarian, who want to halt the nuclear arms race.

The booklet is about something unpleasant and frightening: nuclear war and the death and destruction of all that you treasure, including our own community. This booklet is in five parts. The first part describes nuclear weapons, how many there are and how powerful. The following part describes what would happen in Wellesley if a single one-megaton bomb were dropped over the Raytheon plant in Waltham. The third part describes the plans for evacuation of people ("crisis relocation") from our area. The fourth section concerns the prevention of nuclear war. The final section tells what you can do.

In preparing this booklet, some material was taken from two similar works, Nuclear War in Vermont and Cambridge and Nuclear Weapons, and from recent government publications. Further information can be obtained from members of the Wellesley Committee for a Nuclear Weapons Freeze steering committee: Bradford Bachrach (235-2161), Don Crawshaw (237-7453), Kitty Gladstone (235-2152), Jerome Grossman, President (235-4678), Alba Jameson (235-3918), Shirley Quinn (235-8463), Abner Shimony (235-8485).

NUCLEAR WEAPONS: HOW MANY? HOW POWERFUL?

Each nuclear warhead is extremely powerful. The explosive power of a bomb or warhead is described by the word "megaton". A one-megaton bomb would have the explosive power of one million (1,000,000) tons of TNT. The bombs which destroyed the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki to end World War II had the explosive power of only 10 to 20 thousand tons of TNT. Therefore, a one-megaton bomb—the size of the kind which could hit us—is 70 times more powerful!

	Hiroshima	Nagasaki
Date/time bomb exploded.....	Aug. 6, 1945—8:16 a.m.	Aug. 9, 1945—11:02 a.m.
Bomb's explosive power.....	12.5 kilotons (KT) (12,500 tons of TNT)	22 kilotons (KT) (22,000 tons of TNT)
Distance above ground.....	1,670 ft.	1,640 ft.
Population of city.....	350,000	280,000
Persons killed.....	140,000 up to Dec. 31, 1945. Most died instantly.	74,000 up to Dec. 31, 1945. Most died instantly.
Property damage:		
Area reduced to rubble.....	5.02 square miles	2.59 square miles.
Total buildings in city.....	76,000	51,000.
Number destroyed.....	51,680 or 68 percent	12,750 or 25 percent.
Number seriously damaged.....	18,240 or 24 percent	5,610 or 11 percent.

"20 million U.S. fatalities represent a level 'compatible with Western values'." (Report in Boston Globe, August 15, 1982, of a statement by Colin Gray, a member of the advisory board for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.)

Altogether the United States and the Soviet Union have so many megatons of large weapons that in a war they would produce nearly 1,000,000 times the explosive power used against Hiroshima. This doesn't include all the smaller, so-called tactical nuclear weapons each side has, or the nuclear weapons held by other countries. It means that if a nuclear war were started, by accident or on purpose, by a superpower or another nation or group, the destruction

would be beyond anything ever before experienced by the human race.

WHAT A ONE-MEGATON NUCLEAR WEAPON OVER WALTHAM WOULD DO TO WELLESLEY

Suppose a one-megaton bomb were dropped near ground level over the Raytheon plant in Waltham.

0-2 miles: Out to Exit 16 on the Mass. Pike there will be total destruction of buildings with winds up to 410 miles per hour and with 99 percent of the people dead.

2-3 miles: From Exit 16 to Newton-Wellesley Hospital most buildings will be flattened, with winds up to 180 miles per hour. 50 percent dead from the explosion. Another 25 percent dead later from injuries and burns.

3-5 miles: From Newton-Wellesley Hospital to the Hills Congregational Church, most buildings will be damaged beyond repair with winds up to 150 miles per hour and with up to 50 percent of the population dead. There will also be the risk of deafness from ruptured eardrums.

5-10 miles: From Brigham's in Wellesley Hills to beyond Wellesley College, most buildings will be damaged with winds up to 100 miles per hour and 25 percent dead. Anyone in the open would receive at least 2nd degree burns. A reflex glance at the initial flash from as far away as 35 miles from the explosion would probably cause blindness. A fire storm would kill thousands more either directly or indirectly by suffocation, the fire having consumed all the oxygen.

Lethal radiation would be spread throughout the Wellesley area and beyond for a period of days to weeks, depending upon the weather conditions, nature of the bomb and other factors. Death from radiation would be either rapid or delayed several weeks, depending upon the radiation exposure.

WHAT PLANS HAVE BEEN DRAFTED FOR EVACUATING THE WELLESLEY POPULATION?

The town of Wellesley is part of the Greater Boston Risk Area Suburban West region. Relocation instructions have been prepared. Excerpts and summaries are included in this booklet so that you may determine for yourself whether the crisis relocation plan is an appropriate response to the threat of nuclear war.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) stated in its pamphlet Crisis Relocation Planning (October, 1980), "It seems likely that a crisis would not be abrupt... that people would have time to see, discuss, and understand the instructions for relocation." According to FEMA plans, it will take two and a half days to evacuate the Boston region.

The FEMA Relocation Instructions state that Wellesley and Weston (combined population 38,474) have been assigned to Milford, N.H. (population 8,685). This host community should be reached by using Route 128 to Route 3 to Everett Turnpike to 101A to 101 to Milford. The map on the next page indicates the host community assignments of some of our neighboring communities. Other communities nearby assigned to Route 128 north are Needham, Newton, Wayland, Waltham and Watertown. Because of the number of vehicles that would be heading away from Boston and the metropolitan risk area, car markers are being prepared for residents to clip out and attach to car windshields with tape or glue.

In the FEMA pamphlet, Relocation Instructions, there is a list of survival supplies. In addition to a two-week stockpile of food, families should have on hand and plan to take tools—especially shovels, picks, ham-

mers—essential in improvising a fallout shelter. "Both the residents of the host areas and the city evacuees will have to work hard for a day or more to construct improvised shelters to protect against fallout. In this case, radiation protection would be cheap as 'dirt'."

Crisis Relocation Planning says that the food supply after a few days "would depend almost entirely on present commercial distributors—the people who feed 220 million Americans today." The effect of a nuclear attack upon the distribution system is not mentioned. Little or nothing is said about the destruction of medical facilities at a time when millions may be severely burned; nor of the unavailability of medicines, including morphine for people in great pain; nor of the contamination of water supplies and destruction of sewage facilities; nor of the likelihood of epidemics. Although the possibility of anti-social behavior by evacuees and hostility towards them by the host communities is not dismissed, the pamphlet assures that "in an emergency, people tend to be jolted out of their normal routines and patterns—and many people go out of their way to help others."

THE ONLY DEFENSE AGAINST A NUCLEAR ATTACK: PREVENTION

Civil defense programs, including massive evacuations and shelter buildings, would diminish the loss of life somewhat in the nuclear war. But the statement that "a reasonably effective crisis location program could result in total survival of 80-90 percent of the population" (Crisis Relocation Planning, p. 5) is groundless. And even this excessively optimistic estimate cannot hide the fact that the nuclear attack would cause unprecedented suffering and probably the complete disruption of the society. The painful truth is that there is no defense against nuclear attack, there is no place to hide.

The only sane defense is prevention of a nuclear war. Moreover, further increase of our nuclear armaments is not an effective means of prevention. As former CIA Deputy Director, Herbert Scoville, said, "The U.S. has always been ahead of the Soviet Union in nuclear weapons technology." There is rough parity between the superpowers, each having the capacity to inflict horrible losses on its opponent even if attacked first. This retaliatory capacity constitutes a deterrent to a first strike by either side. This is the main fact that now prevents a nuclear war. A further escalation of the nuclear arms race will make us less rather than more secure. It would increase tension, making each side fear that the enemy may strike first, thus motivating a first strike in the other direction. Deployment of more and faster weapons, with more reliance on radar and computer systems, would greatly increase the probability that war will begin by accident.

Religious groups, scientists, physicians, public officials, ordinary citizens—men and women from all walks of life—are raising their voices to prevent such a war from starting, either by design or accident, through human or mechanical error. At the 1981 National Conference of Catholic Bishops, Archbishop John R. Roach of Minneapolis said: "On a global scale, the most dangerous moral issue in the public order today is the nuclear arms race. The church in the United States has a special responsibility to address this question. . . . The church needs to say 'no' clearly and decisively to the use of nuclear arms."

Many eminent Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant clergymen have made statements asserting that the nuclear arms race threatens the peace of the world, the continuation of civilization, and the survival of the human race. As a first step to halting this plunge toward disaster, many have endorsed a bilateral, verifiable freeze by the United States and the Soviet Union on further deployment, testing, and production of nuclear weapons.●

A NEED FOR FURTHER REFORM

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues in the House an outstanding editorial which appeared in the December 1982 edition of *Venture* magazine regarding the Congress recent action liberalizing the treatment of subchapter S corporations:

A NEED FOR FURTHER REFORM

(By Arthur Lipper III)

While I heartily endorse Congress' action to liberalize Subchapter S treatment for corporations, and applaud the Securities & Exchange Commission for sponsorship of its Government-Business Forum on Small Business Capital Formation, further actions are required to encourage the flow of capital into new ventures.

Any consideration of providing investors with favorable tax treatment for investing in new or small businesses must recognize that most of these businesses lose money, at least in the early stages. And it is generally acknowledged that the primary reasons for small business' high failure rate and broad inability to generate substantial profit are a lack of experienced management and the absence of adequate funding. Therefore, the objective must be to create investment incentives for investors who have both the financial resources and the management acumen to offer to small businesses.

I believe the most appropriate means of encouraging professional investors to commit their money and management skills to small businesses, and particularly new ventures, is to amend Subchapter S regulations to permit the negotiated allocation of operating and non-operating losses among various classes of stockholders. This would be similar to that currently possible between general and limited partners. Such an allocation of losses would, in the case of successful companies, result in those companies becoming taxpayers sooner than would be the case without loss allocations, and should therefore not adversely affect overall tax collections.

Were this proposal adopted, a significantly enhanced rationale would exist for professional investors to assist small businesses. Perhaps more importantly, failure rates should materially decline in those instances where professional investors expend their resources in new and smaller ventures than would otherwise be the case.

Many excellent ideas came out of the SEC forum, and it was gratifying to see a governmental body soliciting comments in an open and honest atmosphere. However, the suggestions which came from the forum cannot lie fallow or get buried in some bureaucratic

quagmire. I especially encourage the approval of a small business or new venture capital gains tax "rollover" provision—similar to that offered homeowners—and a further reduction in capital gains taxes to encourage professional investments in new ventures. The time has come to genuinely foster capital formation for small and growing businesses through regulatory reform and legislative initiative.●

SENATE JUDICIARY CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATION TO REVISE THE JUDICIAL SURVIVORS' ANNUITY PROGRAM

HON. HAROLD S. SAWYER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring the attention of the House of Representatives to an issue which seriously affects the Federal judiciary. In 1956, Congress established the judicial survivors' annuity program (JSAP) in order to provide for the payment of substantial annual benefits to the eligible surviving spouses and children of deceased Federal judges and justices.

Unfortunately, the original formula for funding the annuity program was not thoroughly analyzed in 1956 and it subsequently proved to be actuarially unsound. In 1976, Congress successfully acted to revise and stabilize the annuity program, but concern still exists on the Federal bench over this issue.

The 1976 legislation made JSAP actuarially sound but a number of judges feel that, due to salary freezes and inflation, the program will not adequately protect their spouses and children in the event of their death. The serious consequences of this problem cannot be overstated: Ample evidence exists that members of the bar turn down appointments to the Federal bench and several prominent members on the bench have resigned because of inadequate salaries and benefits.

Because this issue affects not only the quality of our judges, but also the quality of our justice, legislation has been introduced in this Congress to attempt to improve judicial survivors' annuities. On September 24, 1982, the Senate Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Courts held hearings on this legislation, S. 1403 and S. 1874.

The Honorable James Harvey, a respected judge from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan, testified before the Subcommittee on Courts. Jim is a distinguished former Member of Congress from my home State of Michigan who appeared in the Senate on behalf of the judicial administration division of the American Bar Association. As a sponsor and original cosponsor of the companion legislation in the House of

Representatives, H.R. 3909 and H.R. 4763, I include Judge Harvey's statement before the subcommittee in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES HARVEY, U.S.
DISTRICT JUDGE

Mr. Chairman, my name is James Harvey. I have been a United States District Judge in the Eastern District of Michigan for almost nine years. Prior to that time, I served as a member of the U.S. House of Representatives for almost fourteen years, after having practiced law in Michigan for twelve years. I have been a member of the American Bar Association for approximately 25 years, and it is in behalf of that organization, particularly the Judicial Administration Division, that I appear here today.

It is presumptuous of me, Senator Heflin, to tell you about the Judicial Administration Division of the American Bar Association, whom I am authorized to represent. However, it consists of seven conferences, including the National Conference of Federal Judges, of which I am chairman. In the Judicial Administration Division are nearly 7,000 judges from state and federal, trial and appellate courts, as well as administrative law courts, and lawyers with special interest in the Judiciary.

The problem of providing adequate survivors annuities for the Federal Judiciary has been with us for several years. I can recall that during the years I served in Congress, it was necessary on one occasion to pass a special bill to handle the problem faced by the widow of one of the most prominent Justices on the U.S. Supreme Court. It was not, however, until recent years that the increased number of resignations by Federal Judges focused attention on the inadequacy of the survivors annuity program for the U.S. Judiciary. The figures have been cited before. Only seven judges resigned during the 1950's; only eight during the 1960's—but twenty-four resigned in the 1970's; three in 1980 and four in 1981.

It is of great concern to all members of the Bar when we lose the services of a distinguished judge, such as former Judge William H. Mulligan of the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, as well as Judge Philip W. Tone of the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals, both of whom are with us today.

It is of equally great concern to members of the Bar, also, that we may fail to attract to the Federal bench the exceptionally well-qualified lawyer, for the same reasons that caused Judge Mulligan and Judge Tone to resign, namely an inadequate program of survivors annuities.

I therefore wish to express not only my own personal support, but also the support of the Judicial Administration Division of the American Bar Association for the principles of the legislation embodied in S. 1874 and H.R. 4763, either of which bills will help to remedy the inadequacies of the present system.

We are grateful to Chief Justice Warren Burger, and to Judge Irving R. Kaufman of the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, for the leadership they have shown in this effort.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the brief statement of support that I have been authorized to make by the Judicial Administration Division of the American Bar Association be included in the record following my remarks. Thank you for this opportunity to appear.

IN BEHALF OF JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION DIVISION, ABA, IN SUPPORT OF S. 1874 AND H.R. 4763

The Judicial Administration of the American Bar Association wholeheartedly supports the principles of the legislation embodied in S. 1874 and H.R. 4763. We are mindful that there are slight differences between the two bills. However, we are keenly aware of the problems that an inadequate survivors' annuities program has caused within the Federal Judiciary, and we believe that enactment of either S. 1874 or H.R. 4763 would go a long way toward solving these problems. The Judicial Administration Division of the ABA believes that the maintenance of an independent Federal Judiciary is absolutely essential to the future of our Nation. Legislation such as either S. 1874 or H.R. 4763, helps to maintain that independent judiciary by providing a system of survivors annuities that will encourage well-qualified lawyers to accept appointments to positions on the Federal Bench, and will at the same time discourage resignations, of which there have been so many in recent years. For all of these reasons, the Judicial Administration Division supports the enactment of either S. 1874 or H.R. 4763.●

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VALLEY NATIONAL BANK

HON. CARLOS J. MOORHEAD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago, the Valley National Bank was founded in Glendale, Calif. In 1957, unlike today, new banks were a rarity, and Valley National was the community's only independent and locally owned banking institution.

One of the first organizers and a major stockholder was Casey Stengel, longtime Glendale resident, baseball immortal, peerless manager of the New York Yankees, and creator of his own unique brand of English known as "Stengelese."

Valley National, or Casey's Bank as it was often called, was a success from the first day when deposits exceeded \$1 million. After the first year, they exceeded \$5.5 million and within 3 years, the bank had deposits of \$10 million.

In 1960, three former Glendale mayors served on the board of directors. They were John Lawson, Sr., Paul L. Burkhard, Sr., and Robert Wian, founder of the nationally known "Bob's Big Boy" hamburger. That same year, the bank opened its first branch office in Toluca Lake.

Today, Valley National has a solid record of success with six full service branches and assets in excess of \$138 million.

But the greatest asset of Valley National is its people who have demonstrated an enduring motivation to support their community and country, constantly giving time and energy to

those organizations and programs which make a society strong.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the countless contributions made to the people of my district by this very fine organization and I am delighted to join with Clarence Jones, president; Linus Southwick, chairman of the board and founding president; and the board of directors, in celebrating the 25th birthday of Valley National Bank, a community asset of unchallenged value.●

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ALAN SIEROTY

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to a man who is retiring after 21 years of dedicated public service to California: State Senator Alan Sieroty. On December 13 his friends will gather at a special dinner to honor him. I have had the privilege of working with this man, so I know that his retirement from public office is our loss.

Alan Sieroty was born in Los Angeles in 1930 and attended Beverly Hills High School. He graduated Phi Beta Kappa from Stanford University with a degree in economics and received his law degree from the University of Southern California School of Law. From 1961 through 1965, while I held the office of Lieutenant Governor, Alan served that office, first as administrative assistant, and later as executive secretary. In 1965, he was appointed by Governor Brown to serve as deputy director of the Chile-California program.

Alan Sieroty was elected to the State assembly in November 1966, and was reelected five times. He then successfully ran for the State senate in the March 1977 special election. As State senator, he has served as chairman of the Senate Education Committee, and as a member of the Revenue and Taxation Natural Resources and Wildlife, Finance, and Judiciary Committees. Senator Sieroty is also a member of the States and the Arts Committee of the National Conference of State Legislatures.

Senator Sieroty's whole career has been marked by a concern for the protection of constitutional rights and civil liberties. He has also been a strong voice for both consumer and environmental protection, and is known as the author of the California Coastal Zone Conservation Act, adopted by the voters in 1972 as proposition 20. Senator Sieroty has been committed to insuring a quality public education at all levels. He has consistently supported programs which attack

problems of discrimination, unemployment, poverty and the lack of adequate housing and health facilities, particularly as they affect senior citizens. He has been in the forefront of child care legislation and efforts to remove architectural barriers for the physically handicapped.

For his work Senator Sieroty has received awards and commendations from a large number of organizations, including the Los Angeles Children's Center, Los Angeles Junior Chamber of Commerce, National Rehabilitation Association of Southern California, Stamp Out Smog, California Park and Recreation Society, California Association of the Physically Handicapped, California Trial Lawyers Association, Beverly Hills B'nai B'rith, the city of Los Angeles, Correctional Counselors Association, Easter Seal Society, South Bay Chapter of the American Civil Liberties Union of Southern California, Artists for Economic Action, Artist's Equity, Laurel Children's Center, National Council of Jewish Women, California Art Education, and the California Association for the Education of Young Children.

In 1977 Alan Sieroty was appointed by the president of the American Bar Association to serve on the A.B.A. Commission on Correctional Facilities and Services. He is a member of American, California, and Los Angeles County Bar Associations, and of the World Peace Through World Law Association.

His community activities include participation in the American Civil Liberties Union, American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress, Amie Karen Cancer Fund for Children, B'nai B'rith, Friends of the Santa Monica Mountains State Park, the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, the Alcoholism Council of California, the Thelians, Vista Del Mar Men's Association, Western Center for Law and the Handicapped, and the Venice Family Clinic.

I am proud to know a man whose community has honored him in so many ways. My wife, Lee, and I wish all the best for Alan, and his recent bride, Shelli, in their new life together.●

I BELIEVE IN AMERICA

HON. BILL LOWERY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Speaker, once in a very great while, I come across something that exemplifies the American dream. Just recently, I heard Miss Dayna Marie Waitley deliver a poem she wrote as part of her successful competition in the Miss San Diego contest. I urge all my col-

leagues in the House and Senate to take a moment and read her poem. It will, no doubt, inspire you and reaffirm your commitment to a better tomorrow for all Americans.

I BELIEVE IN AMERICA

(By Dayna Marie Waitley)

I believe in America, I always have and always will.
And, you know, I still get a thrill when I see our flag unfurled . . .
As the strongest hope for freedom in this battle-weary world.
Why do I believe in America?
I can protest, I can preach, I can learn, I can teach.
I can earn, and I can reach.
I can travel anywhere, if I can pay the fare.
I can go from rags to riches, or be happy digging ditches
In America, I'm free, to be the me I choose to be!
Where else can you believe what you want?
Worship as you want?
Stay or leave when you want?
And where else can you come from ghettos into greatness,
Like O.J., Sugar Ray, and Dr. J.?
And where else can you write what you want?
Recite what you want?
Go day or night where you want?
Only in America, and I believe in America because we still have a dream
Like when recession ends and inflation ceases.
When our bills are paid and our pay increases.
When our children are safe and free to grow.
And when the other nations can go it alone!
But to believe in America is to believe in ourselves!
That we can ride our own black stallion, or wear that gold madallion!
We can upset Tracy Austin, win a marathon in Boston!
Be a football player, or finish-off Darth Vader!
We can win our race, conquer outer space!
Find world peace, and the treasure that we seek!
We can stay in love, we can rise above!
Reach our highest goal, and be happy in our soul!
So let's grab that dream and then believe it!
Go out and work, and we will achieve it!
Let's love ourselves, but give away all the love we can today!
And close our eyes and truly see the people we'd most like to be!
In America, we're free to be who we choose to be!●

OUTSTANDING ACHIEVEMENTS OF BLUE SPRINGS, MO.

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, It gives me great pleasure to recognize the outstanding achievements of Blue Springs, Mo., a hard-working city in my district which recently became a member of an elite group of Missouri cities. On October 18, 1982, the honorable mayor of Blue Springs, John Mi-

chael, accepted the "All Missouri Certified City Award" presented by the Missouri community betterment program. One of only about 20 cities in the State to receive this award, Blue Springs is the only city in Jackson County, as well as statewide in the 25,000 to 50,000 population class, so honored for its high quality of life, citizen involvement, and favorable economic development conditions.

This is an important step for the city of Blue Springs and the State of Missouri as a whole. Cities receiving this honor reap statewide recognition, an edge in attracting business and industry, and increased civic pride which reflects favorably upon all of us.

I would like to also recognize the city of Nevada, Mo., previously a recipient of this award, which received a renewal of this great distinction this year.

I am proud that the people of the Fourth Congressional District have taken such an active role in the development of this outstanding community. Their pride and civic accomplishments should be taken to heart by all as we look for a means to better our everyday lives.●

ZERO HOUR FOR SOCIAL SECURITY

HON. STAN PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, in the very near future, the President's bipartisan commission on the future of social security will deliver its report to the Congress. While it appears unlikely that this important issue will be taken up for consideration by the lameduck session of the 97th Congress, it will certainly be considered by the incoming 98th Congress.

During the midterm elections, many politicians sought to gain political advantage by using the social security issue as a means to frighten their constituents into supporting their candidacies. The time has come for an end to partisan speechmaking and a beginning toward seeking meaningful solutions to the problem of future funding of benefits given the dwindling base from which the fund can be supported.

While I do not support the merger of social security with the civil service retirement system, I do recognize the need for structural changes in the benefit formula and the tax rate. I do not pretend to know exactly which combination of factors will produce solvency for the social security system, but I am prepared to review the options presented to the Congress and to work for the program which will insure the continuation of this vital program while

distributing the burden for its funding equitably among our Nation's citizens.

A recent interesting article on the subject of social security appeared in the November 8, 1982, issue of U.S. News and World Report which I commend to my colleagues for their information and review.

The article follows:

[From U.S. News and World Report, Nov. 8, 1982]

ZERO HOUR FOR SOCIAL SECURITY

(By Marvin Stone)

Politicians have been finding that any mention of steps to rescue Social Security, as Senator Bob Dole says, is "like talking about the plague." Now, with the election campaigns over, facts must be faced. Something will be done, and few will like it; but if nothing were done, we would like it even less.

In short term, the system could go bankrupt without some new action. In the long term, so few workers would be supporting so many retired people that an ugly confrontation could result.

Till the end of this year, old-age checks can be kept flowing by borrowing billions from the disability-benefit and health-insurance trust funds to supplement tax payments coming in for Old-Age and Survivors Insurance. If that borrowing authority is not renewed, too little will be in hand by the middle of 1983 to make monthly mailings to the retired. If it is renewed, all three funds will go broke in 1984. There's got to be another way.

Suggesting a solution is the business of National Commission on Social Security Reform. Soon the commission will take this political hot potato off the back burner and serve up its recommendation to Congress. That will be a choice or combination of changes that nobody wants but everybody must weigh.

Social Security's short-term needs may be met by speeding up the scheduled increases in payroll taxes, pruning benefits of future retirees, lowering cost-of-living adjustments, drafting federal workers into the system, contributing cash out of the general revenues, increasing and earmarking excise taxes and/or making some part of the benefits subject to the federal income tax. This last step naturally is poison to politicians, but it does recommend itself in one way: Normal operation of the tax law would spare the very poor who have little income from other sources.

The confrontation after the year 2000 is on a different order. It grows out of the maturing of the country, its people and its institutions—an inexorable and somewhat frightening process. In 1950, fifteen years after the creation of Social Security, more than 16 workers were paying taxes into the system's coffers for every retired person who was drawing benefits, and it seemed as if the trust fund would stay in surplus forever.

It took a long time, but that had to change. Bigger and bigger numbers retired. The life span lengthened: Life expectancy after 65 increased substantially, and that meant more people living to draw benefits. Today, the ratio of taxable workers to retired beneficiaries is only a little over 3 to 1. By the year 2025, which many Americans now employed will live to see, there will be only approximately 2 workers for every beneficiary. Workers might rebel. The result could be an unpleasant scene, requiring

painful, even catastrophic, readjustments. Better that the changes be planned in advance.

Some of the measures discussed to preserve Social Security over the next few years could come into the picture also for the longer run, but the most promising long-range suggestion is to put off retirement under the plan to a later age—perhaps, eventually, 68.

This idea has been around for a while, but the commission, in its preliminary studies, has supplied a rationale and outlined a tentative formula for phasing in the new retirement dates by a few months each year.

Because Americans' life expectancy at 65 has increased by more than three years since the program began, advocates of longer careers believe such a solution is justified. And, aware that people need time to plan their lives, they do not propose to have the shift begin till A.D. 1990 or 2000.

But a decision on the future of Social Security must not be put off until a moment of desperation, when hostility, failure and distress may result. If legislators cannot, as seems likely, find time for it in the coming special session, then the new Congress in January must make ready for early action. ●

HONORING REDLANDS UNIVERSITY

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 75th anniversary of one of California's leading universities, the University of Redlands located in Redlands, Calif. I would like to take this opportunity to join with the graduates, students, faculty, and administrators in honoring this fine institution today.

Chartered on November 25, 1907, the University of Redlands admitted its first students in September 1909. The story of the University of Redlands is the story of an institution much changed from its founding and yet in spirit unchanged from its original commitment to educate not only the mind but also the heart.

The University of Redlands was born out of the devastation of the San Francisco earthquake when the Rev. Jasper Newton Field decided to move his Baptist college from the crumbled city to Redlands. There, the college has been nurtured and has matured into one of California's leading universities.

In 1909 9 professors and 52 students made the school a reality in the midst of the construction of the administration building. A graduating class of four, including President Field's daughter, proudly accepted their diplomas in June.

Traditions began with important links which are presently shared by members of the university and community today. The "R" in the local mountains was created by energetic undergraduates in 1913-14. The Zanja

Fiesta became an annual musical extravaganza. A school newspaper, fraternities and sororities, athletics and campus life began to coalesce. Most significant was the commitment to the liberal arts tradition and to the education of students who would be sent forth to do good and undertake service to improve their world.

Victor Leroy Duke, a member of the original faculty and a man of vision, guided the university during the 1920's. He and the trustees rejoiced in the Rockefeller Foundation grant which enabled great strides to be made academically. More dormitories were added to the residential campus, additional classrooms were built, a handsome Memorial Chapel now anchored the north end of the quad, and the University of Redlands was unequivocally adopted.

The thirties brought a close campus rapport under the administration of President Clarence Howe Thurber. Thurber brought with him the air of the cosmopolitan East, a highly charged academic commitment, and a determination to make Redlands' students "learners." The depths of the depression were reached in 1936, and it proved that Redlands was no Camelot either. Thurber resigned and the university was vying within itself for a sense of direction.

Elam J. Anderson became president of the University of Redlands until his sudden death in 1944. World War II profoundly changed the university. With the building of a new commons and the coming of a new president, George H. Armacost, a new phase of university life began. It was a time of continuity, new social life developments, a vigorous building campaign, and an increase in the endowment. Those post-World War II years saw veterans returning as students and the dorms nearly bursting their seams.

President Armacost concluded 25 years of service retiring in 1965. During his tenure enrollments were up, the pool of students high, government money for higher education plentiful. As a result, academic achievement, sporting achievements, and student living innovations excelled at a high pace.

Certain innovations from the 1960's provided positive experiences for Redlands. Excellence in scientific programs, firm commitment to liberal arts, and the advantages of foreign resident programs. A new college for returning of older students was begun.

The end of the 1970's brought about intense discussions and a firm resolve to secure the university's future and keep undiminished its purpose of liberal arts education with quality.

Following the resignation of Dr. Eugene E. Dawson as president in 1978, the new—and current—President Douglas R. Moore inherited an institu-

tion vulnerable to the challenges afflicting all private higher education: less money, higher costs, fewer students. At present the strength of the campus, the ongoing growth of its programs and outreach, the quality of its students and its higher enrollment is the answer that the university community gave to the priorities of President Moore.

The 75th anniversary speaks of achievements and of work and of efforts to care for, guide, and exert love for an institution. Its original resolve remains bright: to serve the mind and heart.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege to commend the University of Redlands to the House of Representatives for not only its past achievements, but for future limitless possibilities in the educational forum. ●

THE TROUBLED TANK

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, the issue of extravagance in the military continues. It is apparent that we are not getting maximum benefit in terms of the taxpayers' dollars expended for the Defense Department. I have had occasion to address this matter a number of times in regard to shortfalls, mismanagement, and sheer waste in defense spending. The time has come to tackle this matter head on and to make certain that we do not allow this type of waste to continue.

Insofar as the litany of sorrows is concerned, the M-1 tank is a classic example of incompetence and costly expenditures in the military.

I would like to share with my colleagues, a recent editorial, "The Troubled Tank" which appeared in the New York Times. This article provides a graphic account of military extravagance.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 22, 1982]

THE TROUBLED TANK

The Army's new tank, the M-1, is the centerpiece of efforts to improve the United States' conventional forces. Yet this critical weapon appears to have severe problems and despite the Army's constant assurances, the success of the \$19 billion program is far from certain.

The M-1 is the Army's third attempt to build a new tank, its two predecessors having being canceled by Congress as too costly and too complex. The Army's own tests of the M-1, made public by the Project on Defense Procurement, reveal a disturbingly similar pattern.

The versions tested last fall proved so delicate as to require six times the maintenance of the Army's present main battle tank, the M-60. As a test of durability, half the M-1's are supposed to be able to travel 4,000 miles

without major breakdown in the power train. But only 15 percent did so in last year's operational tests, a decrease from 47 percent in 1979. The Army says the problems have been corrected, but recently new durability tests were suspended after all five tanks taking part broke down.

Even if the M-1's persistent glitches can be fixed, critics consider the tank to have fundamental design errors. Chief among these is the choice of a gas turbine engine. The M-1 uses twice as much fuel as the diesel-driven M-60, is sensitive to dust and gives off intense heat that will attract infrared-seeking missiles and emblazon its position on the thermal viewing devices of Soviet tanks. No other tank in the world has a jet engine; why the M-1? The Army gambles that it will be harder and easier to fix.

The M-1 is protected by a novel armor designed to keep out the "shaped charge" fired by infantrymen. But this Chobham armor is so bulky that it is used only on the front half. The rear is more thinly armored than the M-60. Also, Chobham armor does not always defeat the standard kinetic-energy round used by tanks against one another, yet the M-1's designers take an extraordinary risk, that of storing its ammunition above the line between hull and turret, just where most hits are scored.

Ironically, the best feature of the M-1 is its 105-millimeter cannon, identical to that on the M-60. Yet the complex electronics added to the gun seem in some instances to degrade its performance and are often switched off by the crew.

Without doubt the M-1 is a hot-rod tank—it can cruise at 45 miles an hour and has wonderful suspension. But on present evidence it is in many ways a less effective weapon than the M-60, designed more than 20 years ago. During the war in Lebanon Israeli M-60's, cheaply but thoroughly modified, were highly successful against Syria's Soviet T-72's. Would the M-1 have performed as well? In last year's tests, half the tanks dropped out of action in five days from mechanical failures alone.

Soviet tanks evolve in gradual, risk-avoiding steps. The M-1 seems a more radical leap than the U.S. Army can comfortably manage. Its complexity has driven costs to a remarkable \$2.6 million per tank and has made manufacture so difficult that the United States can produce fewer new tanks than even inefficient Soviet industry.

Congress has wisely kept under development the diesel engine originally proposed by General Motors. Substituting that for the Chrysler-version gas turbine would cause little real delay and greatly improve reliability. Meanwhile, a new tank needs to be designed—and not the preposterous turretless version of the M-1 that the tank bureaucracy contemplates. A simpler, cost-effective weapon should be shaped by users and tacticians instead of a bureaucratic process in which requirements are piled on, never deleted, until a fighting vehicle becomes a suffering behemoth. ●

IS IT TIME FOR A NEW JOLT TO SPUR EDUCATION?

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, Mike Bowler, an editorial writer for the Pa-

ducah Evening Sun, has written an editorial piece commenting on where we are 25 years after sputnik in the field of education.

The implication of his article is clear: That if the Nation is not to fall behind, it has to pay more attention to education.

And I concur with that conclusion completely.

I urge my colleagues to read the article.

IS IT TIME FOR A NEW JOLT TO SPUR EDUCATION?

"The message which this little ball carries to Americans, if they but stop and listen, is that in the last one-half of the Twentieth Century . . . nothing is as important as the trained and educated mind."—Chancellor Franklin D. Murphy of the University of Kansas, commenting on the launching of Sputnik, 25 years ago tomorrow.

(By Mike Bowler)

Sputnik changed the face of American education as perhaps no other event in the Twentieth Century. Seen as a threat to national security, *Iskustvennyi Sputnik Zemli*—"artificial traveler around the earth"—spurred a massive federal effort to improve education in mathematics, science and foreign languages.

Today, most observers believe a similar crisis is at hand. The statistics bear them out. But while the crisis may be similar, the times have changed.

In the first days, no one made the connection with a falling U.S. education system. There was worry about America's defense posture, about Sputnik's potential for spying, about when and where it would land.

Then it began to sink in. On October 7, three days after Sputnik was launched, G. Mennen Williams, the governor of Michigan, said Sputnik "reminds us uncomfortably that Soviet education has for some years turned out twice as many engineers and scientists as have we."

Others quickly got on the bandwagon. Statistics spewed forth: A third of all high school students qualified for college failed to continue their education because of lack of funds. The proportion of top-quality faculty members was declining. Less than 15 percent of public high school students were studying a foreign language.

President Eisenhower and others who opposed a large federal presence in education began to see scientific illiteracy as a threat to national security. Congress sifted through a bundle of aid-to-education bills—some 150 in all—and enacted the National Defense Education Act of 1958, a compact, 25-page document (including a loyalty oath requirement) that clearly placed the federal government as a partner in education.

By the time Neil Armstrong walked on the moon 11 years later, 1.5 million men and women had gone to college under NDEA's Title II National Student Loan Program. Title III, originally written to strengthen elementary and secondary instruction in science, had been broadened to include 50-50 matching grants to the states covering a wide range of subjects.

The Title IV graduate fellowship program had enabled more than 15,000 students to complete doctoral degrees. Thousands of teachers had gone to NDEA summer workshops. And so on. The NDEA had invested

some \$3 billion in American education by the time of the moon walk.

Scientific research and a rewriting of much of the nation's public school curriculum also were prompted by Sputnik. To build up scientific and engineering manpower, the National Science Foundation eventually sponsored 53 curriculum projects. A new curriculum in physics was soon followed by mathematics, chemistry, biology and the social sciences.

Not all were successful, but the Biological Sciences Curriculum Study, the only reform project still alive, revolutionized the teaching of high school biology. Students no longer memorized biological facts systematically. They considered the process of life's development, and they got a heavy dose of evolutionary theory, which BSCS called the "warp and woof" of modern biology. "There isn't a textbook that isn't influenced by BSCS," says William V. Meyer, a former director.

But this 25th anniversary of Sputnik is marked by irony. A number of factors in the 1970s—the change in federal emphasis to the war on poverty, television, grade inflation, the emphasis on "relevance" over basics, the political right's trampling of some of the more daring curriculum reforms, and now the federal retreat from aid to education in general—either singly or in combination put the nation back to Square 1.

The American Association for the Advancement of Science complains: "even now too few Americans have the science or mathematics grounding to keep America in the forefront technologically and economically." There is a scarcity of trained personnel in several scientific fields. Only one junior or senior in 14 takes physics. Much of the laboratory equipment in colleges and universities is obsolete or worn out. College and university research suffers.

At the root of the problem is a severe shortage of qualified science and mathematics teachers. Last year a survey of state science supervisors found a shortage of high school chemistry teachers in 38 states, a shortage of math teachers in 43 states and a shortage of physics teachers in 42 states.

Last spring, only 17 new mathematics teachers graduated in Maryland, and eight went into teaching. There is a related but no less bleak statistic: Scholastic Aptitude Test scores of would-be teachers are lower on the average than those of almost all other college-bound students.

The status of science and mathematics teaching is so critical because, even by optimistic estimation, it will take a decade or more to reverse the trend. Meanwhile, proposals to attract students to math and science teaching by giving them extra pay run into fierce opposition from teachers' unions.

"Of course, we could solve the problem by next Monday if we really wanted to," says Stephen Willoughby, president of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. "All we have to do is double all teachers' salaries—not just mathematics teachers. It would take \$30 billion to \$40 billion and is probably politically not feasible, but it's a drop in the bucket compared to what we spend on defense."

"The problem isn't a shortage of people willing and able to do the job. It's a shortage of math teachers, and it's chronic shortage. Only in 1969 were there as many teachers as there were jobs. We've always experienced a drain of math teachers to higher paying jobs outside of education."

Steven Muller, president of Johns Hopkins University, agrees. "The quality of the

public schools has deteriorated substantially over the past two decades," he says, "and the best evidence is what teachers are paid. There's a sad irony here. That is that we're getting more than our money's worth."

Terrel H. Bell was a new superintendent in Ogden, Utah, when Sputnik was launched. Today he is Secretary of Education. He does not deny that there are "serious and urgent" problems with American education, but neither does he promise a new NDEA.

"We can't afford it with the economy we have now," he says in an interview.

Secretary Bell is not without solutions. Schools could simply dictate more study of science and math, or they could put an end to the single salary schedule for teachers, paving the way for rewarding those in science, math and foreign languages. More attention could be paid to gifted students. Colleges could make entrance exams more stringent. Teachers could be rewarded for not becoming administrators. "There are many things that could be done immediately, if only local boards and teachers would do them."

And if they cost money, who will pay? "The place where I'd like to see more initiative is the state legislatures. That's where the responsibility rests. Legislatures ought to take education more seriously than they do. Education ought to be as important to the states as defense is to the federal government."

Everyone says another Sputnik jolt is in order, but no one can predict what form one might take. Perhaps, Dr. Muller and others suggest, what has happened has been more subtle. "Sputnik gave us a benign jolt," Dr. Muller says. "It gave us pause without giving us critical injury."

In 1982 perhaps real damage has been done. Dr. Muller cites the U.S. failure to meet the "Japanese challenge" in technology and the "virtual collapse" of the domestic auto and steel industries. (Unlike the U.S., secondary education in Japan is heavily weighted toward science and math, and Japanese colleges grant four times the U.S. number of baccalaureate degrees in engineering and eight times the number of advanced engineering degrees.)

Jolt or no jolt, there are plenty of plans afoot. An "American Defense Education Act," a modern version of the discarded NDEA, was introduced in Congress in June. In early September, three senators introduced legislation that would devote \$400 million to training in mathematics, science and foreign language.

There are also more far-reaching proposals, such as Boston University President John Silber's "GI Bill in reverse," which would make federal funds available prospectively to those who promise to become doctors, nurses, scientists or teachers. Dr. Muller says he personally prefers a combining of voluntary national service, not restricted to the military, with a "reborn GI Bill."

Most observers believe the way to the Reagan administration's heart is through national defense, just as it was the way to another Republican administration's heart a quarter of a century ago. But Dr. Bell offers no hope that the administration will support bills that cost money—and almost all of them do.

"This administration ought to be willing to make the necessary changes," says the mathematics council's Dr. Willoughby. "If they're really interested in the long-term defense of the country, and they say they

are, then clearly the way to keep the national defense strong is through better education."●

GEORGIA'S SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTER

HON. PARREN J. MITCHELL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the unanimous efforts of Dr. Fred C. Davison, president of the University of Georgia, and Dr. William C. Flewellen, Jr., professor of business and industrial development at the University of Georgia. These individuals have tirelessly worked to improve the availability of the university's small business development center (SBDC) to the State's small and minority businesses.

In the age of huge conglomerates and transnational corporations, Dr. Davison and Dr. Flewellen have remembered the essential role small businesses play in the Nation's overall economic health. We must realize the small and minority businesses account for almost half of the Nation's private gross national product. Small businesses are the primary sources for new private sector employment and account for 50 percent of all major innovations. Finally, the small business sector is the most competitive segment of the economy at a time when the free market is more highly regarded in theory than in practice.

The University of Georgia's SBDC will inject vitality into the small business community by providing counseling, continuing education, and applied research services. In addition, Georgia's small businesses will benefit from the university's technological breakthroughs by way of the SBDC. For instance, the University of Georgia is in the forefront of research concerning the conversion of biomass into food, fiber, chemicals, fuel for fermentation, and energy. The SBDC will insure that once patents for these conversion processes exist, they will be available to the State's small businesses. Consequently, Georgia will contain a number of profitable enterprises which provide marketable services for the expanding needs of the world population.

It has been estimated that the SBDC, through its 10 district offices, is in a position to assist the 120,000 businesses in Georgia. In 1982-83, for example, the SBDC will assist 4,000 businesses with counseling services and 13,500 with short courses. I believe these statistics are a clear indication of the almost boundless potential of the SBDC to assist Georgia's small businesses. Clearly, the University of Georgia's SBDC, under the judicious

guidance of Dr. Davison and Dr. Flewellen, will assist small businesses in their attempts to stay afloat on the precarious economic waves that Reaganomics has created.

THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA,
Athens, Ga., October 14, 1982.

HON. PARREN J. MITCHELL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PARREN: When Dr. Fred Davison, President of the University of Georgia, and I visited with you last month, you requested a brief written statement about the prominent role within the University that has been given the Small Business Development Center at the University of Georgia so that you could read the statement into the Congressional Record.

I am looking forward to working with you to improve the status of small business in the U.S. and to working toward better small business relations with the African nations.

Sincerely yours,

W. C. FLEWELLEN, JR.,
University Professor of
Business & Industrial Development.●

PHARMACY ROBBERY STATISTICS

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to point out that 186 Members of the House have joined as cosponsors—as I have done—to legislation (H.R. 2034) introduced by Representative HENRY HYDE, which would make the armed robbery or attempted armed robbery of controlled substances from a pharmacy a Federal offense.

Counting this overwhelming cosponsorship and other separate bill introductions that are almost identical to Mr. HYDE's proposal, there are more than 200 House Members who are on record in favor of seeking a greatly needed change in the law to combat a national epidemic of crimes against drugstores and the ugly byproduct of death and violence that accompanies theft by force. In addition, it is my understanding that a majority of the Senate has also sponsored companion bills.

In view of this broad base of support in both Chambers for pharmacy robbery legislation, it is my hope that the House and Senate leadership will give all due consideration to schedule one of these pending measures during the special session since crimes against our Nation's community pharmacies have been escalating at an alarming rate. The most recent statistics from the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) show that there were 1,908 such armed robberies in 1981 involving a staggering total of more than 4.8 million dosage units of controlled substances. The estimated street value of

these narcotics would very easily exceed \$250 million.

The DEA drugstore robbery statistics represent an increase of 160 percent in the number of robberies between 1973 and 1981. During this 8-year period some 11,786 drugstores became targets for the criminal element, and according to the Justice Department, 1 out of every 5 of these armed robberies results in either serious injury or death.

Finally, I would like to express my concern for remarks that were recently printed in the Washington Post Sunday Magazine on November 7, 1982, in which a colleague was quoted as saying that the pharmacy crime matter was an issue that had been invented by a lobbyist representing pharmacies in order to justify his job. Certainly the statistics I have referred to that have been compiled by the DEA and the DOJ prove just the opposite. I think that the pharmacy organizations and individual pharmacists should be commended for bringing this matter to our attention because this particular crime problem is growing as our Federal law enforcement agencies have become more effective in tightening the reins against illicit drug traffic. With the Reagan administration waging an all-out war against traffickers, addicts, and criminals, I believe that the Congress also has an obligation to crack down on crime and find some form of protective relief for pharmacists. These health-care professionals are providing an important service to our communities by dispensing drugs that cure illnesses and relieve pain, but pharmacists are also being victimized and killed because they stock and dispense certain medications that can command astronomical street prices.

Although the Hyde bill or Senator THURMOND's proposal (S. 2572) may not be the entire answer that we seek to remedy the problem, I feel that the provisions contained in these measures calling for more stringent penalties and sentencing are appropriate for debate. It is my hope that the House Judiciary Committee will find time in its demanding schedule to review this entire matter, since the violence and the diversion of dangerous drugs is an important issue worthy of congressional attention.●

THE YEAR OF THE ST. LOUIS CARDINALS: A TRIBUTE

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, the extraordinary athletic wizardry and flawless ability of our beloved St. Louis Cardinals in capturing the 1982

World Series have brought great fame and recognition to our beloved St. Louis.

All of us were thrilled by their tenacity, drive, stamina, and "Never Say Die" attitude as they came from behind to decisively defeat the Milwaukee Brewers.

The 1982 St. Louis Cardinals represent profiles in courage. They possess remarkable talent and serve as exemplars for all residents of St. Louis. Their talented play, high resolve, splendid sportsmanship, and infectious spirit of bonhomie continued long after the final play. Each citizen of St. Louis and Missouri can take justifiable pride in their enduring accomplishments.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, am proud to congratulate an unusual group of Red Birds: The St. Louis Cardinals. They are a class group and they have etched an indelible athletic record that sustains and inspires the world. Truly, they are world champions, and I exemplify the spirit and thought of every Missourian in saying: "We are most proud of you Cardinals, and you have given us a rich legacy to treasure in years to come." Congratulations.●

THE RETIREMENT OF JUDGE HAROLD H. BOBIE

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, on October 11 the legal community and numerous citizens in Genesee County, Mich., held a reception to honor Harold H. Bobie, who was retiring after a distinguished career completed by 11 years as Federal bankruptcy judge for the U.S. District Court for Michigan's Eastern District. I was pleased to participate in that event honoring Judge Bobie and would like to share here the highlights of his career.

Judge Bobie's career was marked by accomplishment first in the business community and then in the legal profession, as well as by his great contributions of service to the public. At his retirement, he had been a member of the board of trustees of the Flint Osteopathic Hospital for more than 30 years, exemplifying his strong commitment to public service. He also served on the Dye School Board for 14 years, 11 as president, and was a former director of Goodwill Industries, Flint Civitan Club, and the Visiting Nurses Association.

He lived in Flint for most of his life, arriving there in 1919. He worked in the automobile factories of Flint and Pontiac in his youth, and then helped organize the Pure Seal Dairy, Inc., in

1938. He was president of the dairy at the time of its sale in 1958.

Judge Bobier studied law under a proctorship beginning in 1936 and he passed the Michigan Bar in 1943. He was in private practice in Flint from 1943 until 1961, when he was appointed to the bankruptcy court. Throughout his career of both private practice and as a Federal bankruptcy judge he was active in numerous legal organizations, holding a great many leadership positions at the local, State, and national levels. He was a member of the Fellows of the American Bar Foundation and served on the seminar staff of the National Conference of Bankruptcy Judges.●

PATRIOTISM

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, on July 4, 1982, a young woman from Cornwall, N.Y., part of my new congressional district, was the main speaker during the flag ceremony following the July 4 parade. Miss Merritt, who is now in her freshman year at Cornell University, was secretary of the Independence Day Committee and demonstrates by her work and her words the commitment to the American spirit that is being revitalized throughout the United States.

Susan Merritt is an exceptional young woman. She graduated first in her class at Cornwall Central High School, was a national merit finalist, president of the national honor society, captain of the track team, and vice president of the Cornwall youth council. Miss Merritt also showed her community spirit by becoming an integral part of the July 4 planning and ceremonies.

I was quite impressed with the depth of feeling in her speech, and I would like to share Susan Merritt's words with my colleagues as a reminder that the American spirit remains strong in our young people, the real strength and future of America.

FLAG CEREMONY, JULY 4, 1982, CORNWALL, N.Y.

(By Susan Merritt)

As I was thinking over ways to express my feelings as well as those of the July 4th Committee, I came across the word patriotism. My first thoughts upon hearing that word are quite different than those of my parents' generation or my grandparents' generation. I wondered why they should be different. All three generations were born in America, and we have all lived within a few miles of Cornwall. Our history and values are also very similar. The difference is war; uniting against a common enemy. I have never been touched by the patriotism which is spawned in aggression and I have never seen my rights threatened. I hope to God that I never do. Thus, patriotism is a word

seldom used by young people because it has not yet been experienced. However, there certainly are other ways to build patriotic feelings: one is direct threat and another is peacetime celebration. Festivities like those of today are aimed at having a lot of fun, but also at strengthening our patriotism and showing the younger generation how fortunate we are to be Americans.

I know that most of you have heard that sentence before: "You don't know how lucky you are to . . ." Fill in whatever comes next; have a job, have food on the table, go to school, etc. But the truth is that luck plays no part in those and other privileges. The men and women who fought for those rights over 200 years ago did not say to themselves, "I hope we get lucky this time!" They paid the price so that we could be privileged, not lucky.

One of the greatest privileges we can exercise is freedom of choice. My classmates and I have just made one of the most vital choices of our lives. The question was, "Do I get a job, do I get married, or do I go to college?" The decision was difficult, but the important thing is that our country allows the choice to be ours. Many times our right to choose the course of our own lives is taken for granted. Personal preference on smaller issues and majority vote on larger issues has been the norm in all our lifetimes, but in many societies it is not. Our lives were given to us at birth, but our freedom was earned on this date at the birth of our nation.

The young have the same freedoms as adults, though they are the first to say that they don't. Freedom of speech was recently exercised by young people when they made their feelings known about the Village Bench Law. They spoke and the right people listened. How many times have we stood in front of the TV so that our little brother or sister could not see, and answered their cries with, "It's a free country, I can stand wherever I want." Well, the argument works, but in this case it has been misused. Our freedoms of choice, speech, religion, and the press imply responsibility. The responsibility to protect these same rights for others. A child does indeed have the right to stand wherever he likes, provided that, in doing so, he does not infringe upon the right of the other child to watch television. Freedoms cannot exist without the responsibility to use them well.

This weekend's events are aimed primarily at creating a revival of old-time spirit. We are trying to reach as many people as possible with the theme God and Country. For the young, we hope to persuade them to think seriously. I know that old-time spirit does not mean very much to kids, but it has to begin somewhere. Celebrations such as this one help a great deal, but the spirit starts by thinking.

The huge parade we have just seen is proof that the town and village can unite and accomplish great things together. It is this unity which the Independence Day Committee has worked to achieve. Our nation came together in much the same way in 1776, and the results were equally laudable.●

THE RETIREMENT OF JEROME H. BERENSON

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the retirement of the presiding judge of the Ventura County Superior Court, Jerome H. Berenson.

Jerome H. Berenson was born May 13, 1914 at Salida, Colo. In 1920 his family moved to California and settled in the San Diego area. He attended public school in La Jolla, Calif., and thereafter attended the University of California at Berkeley where he received his undergraduate degree in 1935 and his law degree from Boalt Hall School of Law in 1938. He was admitted to the bar on November 1, 1938.

In 1939, Berenson returned to his family home in San Diego and served as assistant public attorney in that area. In 1942, with the world at war, he joined the U.S. Navy and served until 1946, retiring with the rank of lieutenant commander.

After the war, he settled in Oxnard where he entered practice with Ben Nordman in 1947. He remained in practice until 1962 when he was appointed to the Ventura County superior court bench by then Gov. Edmund G. Brown, taking office November 1, 1962.

Following appointment in 1962, Judge Berenson was elected to his office in 1964 and reelected in 1970 and 1976. During 15 of the 20 years Judge Berenson has served on the superior court, he has been the presiding judge (longer than any other judge in California sitting in a multijudge court).

Judge Berenson is presently the senior member of the court in terms of the number of years of service on the bench. He has been presiding judge and a member of the appellate department for 5 years and has been the presiding judge of the juvenile court for 7 years.

In 1976, Judge Berenson was appointed by Chief Justice Donald Wright, of the California Supreme Court, to head the sentencing practices advisory committee to formulate criteria for the implementation of the new determinant sentencing law.

Judge Berenson is the past president of the Ventura County Board of Education, the Ventura County Bar Association and the Ventura County Council of Navy League of the United States.

On October 1, 1947, Jerome Berenson married Carolyn Straus and currently resides with his wife of 35 years in the city of Oxnard. The Berensons

have two grown sons, Jeffrey and Craig.

Jerry Berenson is an outstanding, courageous jurist, an excellent lawyer and a very good friend. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating him on his career and wishing him the best in the future.●

SOVIETS' NUCLEAR BUILDUP CONTRADICTS TALK OF PEACE

HON. DOUGLAS K. BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● **Mr. BEREUTER.** Mr. Speaker, as we return to finish the business of the 97th Congress, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a short editorial which was published in the Omaha World Herald on October 25, 1982. The commentary provides a sharp insight into several aspects of the current nuclear freeze movement, and is reprinted below:

The article follows:

[From the Omaha World Herald, Oct. 25, 1982]

SOVIETS' NUCLEAR BUILDUP CONTRADICTS TALK OF PEACE

President Reagan and Sen. Jeremiah Denton, Ala., earlier this month found themselves charged with McCarthyism, or "guilt by association," in connection with statements each made about the nuclear freeze movement.

Denton irritated some of his Senate colleagues during debate on a "Peace Day" resolution supported by several wives of senators. He called the proposal a "sucker deal" and suggested that the organizers, either consciously or unconsciously, were doing the work of the Soviet KGB.

Reagan, several days later, infuriated advocates of a nuclear freeze by saying that the freeze movement was being "manipulated" by "some who want the weakening of America."

There is no evidence that the nuclear freeze movement in this country is inspired or manipulated by Communists.

On the other hand, it would have been fair and accurate for Reagan or Denton to note that the call for a nuclear freeze is consistent with the Kremlin's goals.

The point can be made—without impugning the motives of the anti-nuclear people—that the Soviets oppose the modernization of the U.S. nuclear deterrent and that a freeze would have the same effect.

The Soviet's pro-freeze position is transparently self-serving. The Kremlin continues to trumpet the theme that the United States is responsible for an "arms race." But the dramatic buildup of Soviet armaments that has upset the nuclear balance in recent years is ignored.

While leading the applause for a freeze and for anti-U.S. demonstrations in recent months, the Soviets have ruthlessly suppressed a Russian peace organization that had the temerity to organize in Moscow without government sponsorship.

One of the organizers said the group was formed because all other Soviet peace groups "reflect only the government point of view." The group called upon the Soviet

Union, as well as the United States, to halt nuclear testing and to seek a reduction in tensions.

For this offense, members of the group were arrested, harassed and isolated from a group of government-sanctioned peace marchers from Scandinavia who had been given permission to enter the Soviet Union.●

AFTER LEBANON: AN OPPORTUNITY FOR PEACE

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● **Mr. BINGHAM.** Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with you and my colleagues an insightful speech on the Middle East made recently by our distinguished colleague from New York, BENJAMIN ROSENTHAL. The occasion for his speech was the biannual national board conference in New York City of Women's American ORT (Organization for Rehabilitation through Training).

ORT has often been called the charity to end all charity because of its policy of teaching people skills so they can stand on their own feet. Since 1880. In Czarist Russia, ORT has built a worldwide network of 800 vocational and technical schools on five continents which has helped more than 2 million people of all colors and creeds to become independent, productive citizens.

In speaking to this prominent organization, Representative ROSENTHAL presented some interesting reflections on recent events in Lebanon which I feel are deserving of wider dissemination:

I am particularly honored to be speaking before you today at your Biannual National Board Conference. For over a century ORT has been helping the Jewish people. And, since the birth of Israel, you have diligently contributed to the growth and prosperity of Israeli society. By your dedication you have assumed a special place in her future.

You have heard from many wise men and women over the years—scholars, spiritual leaders, statesmen. All of them, as all of us, have participated in the great conversation which is so much a part of our history and practice as Jews. I am honored to be among their number, and here with you now.

I speak today as a member of the U.S. Congress, as a senior member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and as someone whose principle mission for twenty years has been to stand for the interests of Israel and to mobilize support for that nation in the councils of American government. No duty has been more important, more demanding, and more complex.

What I can share with you from my own specific vantage point in Congress is the general sense of the landscape after Lebanon—the atmosphere and mood in Washington against which we must all measure our present and future purpose. It is an atmosphere that contains much speculation but little information. There has been all too much sensationalism and simplification of

events. The media have presented us more with the spectacle of conflict than the search for meaning. But clearly the stakes of this historical moment are high indeed. And so, I would say, it is time for the passion and fury of recent months to quiet, and yield to sober reflection and judgment. It really is time to think.

I can tell you, first of all, that no event in Israel's history has affected public and congressional opinion more intensely than the conflict in Lebanon. To be honest, I must also say that the effect in the short run has been negative. In the short run, I'm not measuring this in public opinion polls, though they confirm it. I have in mind scores of personal conversations with trusted friends and colleagues—informal and genuinely candid exchanges in the halls of Congress, as we talk together in relative privacy. It's been very hard. Old friends have been shaken, potential allies put off. Again and again, I found it necessary to urge colleagues to wait, to reflect, to look at the larger picture, to consider the long-run.

However, as two factors emerge from the fog of sensationalism, I fully expect that the mood in Congress will shift. First is the extraordinary and exemplary behavior of the people of Israel. Their soul-searching, their honesty, their passion for justice, and their willingness to draw meaning from the painful events—all have reinforced our common ethical and democratic values. In their willingness to ask hard questions of themselves, the Israeli people have reminded Americans of what is best in ourselves, and in shared political and moral legacy.

Insofar as all of us have participated in that process—Jews all around the world—I think we have reason to be proud. It hasn't been easy. All of you know this, from experiences in your own communities, with your own friends and associates. But it is a process that has strengthened us, and we will look back on this period as one of deepened understanding and moral resolve. In this, the people of Israel, once again, have made a statement to the world—one, perhaps all of us here today should acknowledge and affirm.

To this reaffirmation of the morality of the Israeli people, we must add the new geopolitical realities of the region brought about by recent events. The northern borders of Israel are now secure from relentless terrorism. There is peace and stability for the tens of thousands who have lived so long with the fear of death. The army of terrorism—the PLO—has itself been routed and split apart. So, too, the weakness of the rejectionist Arab states and their failure to enlist others in their cause has been dramatically exposed. Fanaticism in the Arab world has proven to be a vehicle for suicide. The Soviet Union has been discredited as a protector of the Arab bloc. A stable and peaceful Lebanon—once merely a pipe dream—is now at least a possibility. And finally, perhaps most important, Israel has secured a genuine opportunity to conduct peaceful negotiations from a position of strength.

Here the picture is more difficult to read. I believe that present circumstances present a relatively unique occasion for diplomatic progress. But I think it would be a mistake to ignore the complexity of the moment, and the difficulties which lie before us.

Clearly, after Lebanon, the way of war has never seemed less promising to thoughtful, moderate Arabs. But they will only come forward if they are encouraged to do so—not with false promises and gestures—

but with tough-minded actions by the United States to make clear the potential rewards of peace and the consequences of failure.

And what of Israel? While the ultimate decision lies with Israel, her friends can, and should, contribute to the dialogue with a vigorous assessment of the choices. This is both proper and productive and a source of strength—not of division.

I do not believe that it is ultimately in Israel's interests to rest with the status quo. I think it is in her interests to build through aggressive diplomacy upon what has been achieved through painful conflict. Camp David proved that.

There are those—and they have, as always, considerable influence in official Washington—who see negotiations primarily as a means to court the oil-producing Arab nations, not to bring about a just peace. Israelis and their friends are not wrong to be suspicious of calls for negotiations coming from such quarters. And I can assure you that we who stand for Israel in Congress will be outspoken when such peace plans are discussed with us, formally and in private.

For American Jews this approach adds yet another dimension of complexity. How do we see our role, caught between different degrees of allegiances, in the midst of an enormously complex situation?

The present job of the American Jewish community, it seems to me, is twofold. We must stand united in our unswerving support for the state of Israel itself. And we must keep the American government principled and honest in its role as Middle East negotiator.

That means saying Yes to Camp David, but No to the participation therein of the PLO. That means saying Yes to conciliation, but no to any effort which does not begin with Arab recognition of Israel's right to exist—a simple recognition of reality, and not some diplomatic concession to be rewarded in kind.

And it means saying Yes to the Reagan Administration's desire to advance the process of peace, but No to any effort to write the script of a settlement in advance.

I take a dim view, for example, of efforts to tell Israel what her borders ought to be, or wherein her security truly lies. And I take a dim view of welcoming an Arab delegation with pomp and geniality, while the Administration prepares for the visit of Prime Minister Begin by leaking stories of its intention to reprimand him. This is not the course of peace, and we must be forthright in saying so.

Matters like these make all the more clear how important the U.S. Congress is to the future of Israel. When the history of this period is written, I believe the importance of Congressional independence will be even more clear.

Again and again, congressional action has been necessary when the Executive branch has tilted toward Arab nations. I have had to help initiate such action all too often in my twenty years of service and activity on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

In 1967, we had to pressure President Johnson to speed up deliveries of Phantom jets to Israel. A year later, we had to push President Nixon to make good on a similar sale. In 1975, President Ford ordered a punitive "reappraisal" of relations with Israel, which was not terminated until Congress expressed its clear displeasure. That same year, we had to fight the sale of Hawk missiles to Jordan. In 1977, we had to attack

President Carter's proposal to convene a peace conference jointly with the Russians. And you all remember the bitter fight over the sale of AWACs to Saudi Arabia.

The U.S. Congress must be a watchdog for the interests of Israel in any peace process initiated by the U.S. government. And the job of organizations like yours, quite frankly, is to make sure the watchdog is awake.

In coming months, I think such action will be critical. There are too many signs that the administration feels peace in the Middle East requires pressure on Israel. It won't work, and it's not just. Initiative must now come from moderate Arab leaders, recognizing their own self-interest and the clear facts of life in the region. We are at a point—and I say this with great respect for the difficulties—where Arab leaders and people must make a decision of their own. A decision about their own history, their own future, their own identity. The rest of us—Israelis, Americans, Jews—can respect that decision, and make it clear that the course of genuine reconciliation will be rewarded.

The challenge, then, is to be both tough and patient, smart and open. We must be tough about any effort to impose peace, but patient with the process itself. We must be smart in judging how best to conduct negotiations, but we must be open in appreciating the difficulties facing moderate Arab leaders. They face no small task. Everyone saw what it meant for Anwar Sadat.

So too, we must be patient and open with ourselves. Recent events have shown us that even the most painful episodes can be shared and pondered without in any way weakening our essential commitment to Israel. This is an important lesson. There is no reason why it cannot be applied to the great debate which must now begin over terms for peace in the Middle East.

For my part, I want to assure you that Israel's friends in Congress will remain vigilant. No major initiative, no policy decision, no diplomatic effort will be made without our participation. And, in turn, we will take no steps ourselves without talking to people like you, whose strength and wisdom is so much a source of our own. We have not come this far, and gone through this much, to allow Israel's security to be compromised by America's diplomacy. I am convinced that this will ultimately promote, not prevent, the chances for peace in the Middle East.

To all of you, meanwhile, my thanks for myself and for my colleagues in Congress. I cannot tell you how important it is to know that you are here—active and committed and thoughtful—and how important it is to all of us that you continue your good and hard work.●

TRIBUTE TO MARY MASON

HON. THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● **Mr. FOGLIETTA.** Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into the RECORD a copy of a statement I made at a recent dinner honoring Mary Mason, a fellow Philadelphian and an outstanding journalist.

Whereas Mary Mason is celebrating twenty-five years of broadcasting and community service;

Whereas she has been an asset to her community, by working to build strong families and proud neighborhoods;

Whereas she has been an inspiration to young people throughout Philadelphia by advocating the truth and by fighting injustice;

Whereas Ms. Mason enjoys an excellent national reputation for fairness and high quality in broadcasting; and

Whereas she has freely given of her time, her energy, and her personal resources to help others: Now, therefore do I

Commend Mary Mason before the United States House of Representatives, in recognition of her outstanding work and the shining example she has set for her fellow Philadelphians and all Americans.●

A TRIBUTE TO GORDON D. SCHABER

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● **Mr. MATSUI.** Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and my pleasure to officially recognize the outstanding contributions of one of America's finest legal educators, Gordon D. Schaber, who has completed 25 years of leadership as dean of the McGeorge School of Law, University of the Pacific, in Sacramento, Calif.

When he began his tenure in 1957, Gordon Schaber was the youngest dean of a law school in the United States. He is now senior in years of service to any other current law school dean in our country.

Dean Schaber has pursued a distinguished and many-faceted career in his profession. After receiving his law degree from the Hastings College of Law in San Francisco, he was in private practice as a partner in the firm of Schaber & Cecchetti in Sacramento from 1953 to 1965. From 1965 to 1969, he was presiding judge of the Sacramento County Superior Court. And in 1970, after serving part time as dean and professor of the McGeorge School of Law for 13 years, he retired as presiding judge to devote full time to the school.

Complementing Dean Schaber's professional activities has been his service with over 40 boards, commissions, foundations, and committees at the city, county, State, National, and international levels. He is currently serving as chairman of the section of legal education and admissions to the bar of the American Bar Association.

Standing as a testimonial to the quality of service Dean Schaber has rendered to McGeorge Law School is the distinguished faculty he has attracted to the institution in his quarter century of service. Teaching at McGeorge are 50 full-time and about the same number of adjunct faculty members drawn from the local bench and bar. The school now boasts of

almost 4,000 graduates, a great many of whom have been educated during Dean Schaber's tenure.

On October 28, 1982, Gordon Schaber was honored with a silver anniversary testimonial dinner, organized by an appreciative Sacramento community. He was also honored by a resolution adopted by the California Senate and Assembly.

I am sure that all Members of this Congress will join me in paying further tribute to one of America's truly outstanding legal educators, Dean Gordon D. Schaber.●

PRIVATE VERSUS PUBLIC AGAIN, SLOPPILY

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, Albert Shanker, president of the American Federation of Teachers, has a weekly column in the New York Times, a column which is paid for by the Federation of Teachers. But unlike most advertising, it is frequently thoughtful and worth reading with care.

Recently, he had a column in response to an article in the New Republic that said some things that need to be said.

I urge my colleagues to read his column.

WHERE WE STAND

(By Albert Shanker, President, American Federation of Teachers)

Coleman Revisited, With a New Twist

PRIVATE VERSUS PUBLIC AGAIN, SLOPPILY

A large part of the problems facing our public schools comes from sloppy thinking, reporting and writing in the press. The latest example is in one of our nation's best weekly magazines, The New Republic. The November 1 cover story is "Lessons for the Public Schools," by Phil Keisling. Inside the magazine the title is "How To Save The Public Schools," and it turns out to be a review of a somewhat updated version of the discredited Coleman report on private and public high school achievement which first received public attention a year ago.

The Coleman report claimed that students in private schools, even though such schools pay their teachers less and often have larger class sizes, achieve more. Keisling cites the vast body of professional rejection of the Coleman report, including the judgment of Professor Arthur S. Goldberger of the University of Wisconsin that the report "reeked of incompetence and irresponsibility." Keisling also notes that "Coleman doesn't fully account for the effect on a child's achievement of having parents who care enough about education to begin with that they're willing to pay private school tuition." And he points out that Coleman's major conclusions do not show the superiority of private schools but, rather, that those private and public schools which give rigorous courses, require homework, enforce discipline and emphasize academic subjects produce students who are better in academ-

ic areas—a conclusion which is as close to the obvious as one could get.

You would think that, at this point, Keisling would press for most public schools to change in the ways indicated in order to improve student achievement, and he certainly does this. But he also has an additional agenda of his own.

He criticizes the Democrats for stressing two items in their program—opposition to tuition tax credits and greatly increased spending for education. He agrees that tuition tax credits are bad, but he says that we've already increased spending tremendously without improving quality—an opinion which flies in the face of clear evidence showing that the prime targets of federal spending on education, disadvantaged children, have profited handsomely from this attention.

He places blame for educational failure in the public schools on the quality of America's 2.2 million teachers. He points to the inability of teacher training institutions to attract more gifted college students, and he also notes the fact that many talented women who in the past became teachers are no longer entering teaching because they have many other opportunities open to them. Ironically, the very same Keisling who a few lines earlier argues against increasing expenditures for education, here suggests the opposite—paying teachers more. He says: "Something is seriously amiss when a society gives more financial reward to those who hunch over a convoluted legal brief, in search of some new obstructionist tactic to use in an obscure contract dispute, than to those who teach a child to appreciate the eloquence of the written word or the elegance of mathematics." The priorities are right but the thinking is muddled. You can't reward teachers better and thereby attract better teachers unless you upgrade spending—not vastly decrease it as the Reagan Administration has done.

He says big culprits in educational failure are tenure systems and the existence of strong unions. Keisling here perpetuates the myth that it's all but impossible to fire tenured teachers, citing as "evidence" the information that in the last six years, "Philadelphia has dismissed only 24 of its 13,000 teachers." Private schools are better, Keisling suggests, because they can get rid of poor teachers. What's wrong with this? Simply that he has no evidence at all. The Philadelphia figure is phony. He's talking about 24 teachers who decided to fight their dismissal—not about the hundreds who, warned by the principal, left of their own accord . . . or the hundreds who, unable to control a class of 30 or more pupils or overcome by the stress of several years of teaching, opted out. Also, Keisling has no evidence that private schools dismiss teachers with any greater frequency than public schools. In fact, some teachers who are unable to make it in public schools succeed and stay in private schools where they don't have to deal with students who are tough discipline problems.

It always amazes me how those who attack teacher tenure and teacher unions fail to tell us how wonderful the teachers are and how marvelous the student achievement is in states where there are no tenure provisions or strong unions. Have schools been better, for example, in Texas, where there is no tenure and where collective bargaining is just beginning, than in New York? Or California? Again, the evidence doesn't support the conclusion Keisling reaches.

He also blames layoff by seniority for the public schools' deficiencies. But he doesn't suggest another system which would not further damage teacher morale—and make it even more difficult to hire good new teachers. With teacher layoffs a fact of life all around the country every year, who will enter teaching unless down the line, after the career investment has been made, there is some reason to feel secure?

Keisling would have done better to stick to the agenda the research—Coleman's and others'—suggests. We have to get back to a rigorous academic program and enforce discipline. (Keisling correctly points out that it takes only "a few disruptive students to poison the learning atmosphere for everyone" and suggests that many such students "should be removed from regular classrooms so that teachers can focus their energies on students who've shown a willingness to learn.") And, if we have adequate salary incentives to attract good people, test teachers before they're hired, appoint management with the guts to weed out those who, even with help, don't shape up during the probationary period—we'll have the staff Keisling wants. Tenure, seniority and strong unions aren't the obstacles. What's been going on is a failure of will.●

IN RECOGNITION OF TIM MEISTER, LIMA, OHIO

HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, in these times when it seems that so much news is bad, I would like to share with my colleagues a good news incident which occurred in October in the Fourth District that I represent. It is the story of a heroic and successful effort to rescue the life of a small boy.

During dinner one night, 2½-year-old Danial Spence began choking on a piece of chicken. First aid administered by the child's parents, Gale and Anthony Spence, proved unsuccessful as Danial stopped breathing completely, turned black, and went into convulsions. By this time, having reached the early stages of panic, Mrs. Spence rushed her child outdoors in the desperate hope that fresh air would alleviate Danial's condition or that someone would appear who could miraculously save Danial's life.

As she stood on the street, clutching her child and screaming for help, more than a dozen cars drove by, occasionally honking their horns, but offering no help. Finally, a passing driver, Tim Meister, recognized the severity of the situation and performed the miracle Mrs. Spence had hoped for. Almost before Mrs. Spence realized what was happening, Tim managed to dislodge the bone in Danial's throat and Danial began breathing again. Almost simultaneously, an ambulance appeared at the scene, but Mrs. Spence's "knight in shining armor" had disappeared. Mrs. Spence later learned through a

relative of Tim's that it was he who had saved Danial's life.

Tim Meister is truly an individual worth of commendation. He is a person who cares about others, even strangers to him, enough to become involved in their lives. Had he not stopped to help Mrs. Spence, Danial would certainly have choked to death. Mrs. Spence is exceedingly grateful and thankful for Tim's willingness to help. "There should be more people like him in the world," she commented. "I don't know how many cars went by honking horns. He was the only one who stopped and cared enough to help."

It is important to recognize Tim as one whose horizons extend beyond his own personal interests. I admire him greatly for his courage, understanding, and willingness to become involved. I know my colleagues will be proud to join with the Spences and me in expressing our respect and gratitude to Tim Meister of Lima, Ohio.●

INTEREST AND DIVIDEND WITHHOLDING IS BAD LAW

HON. NORMAN E. D'AMOURS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. D'AMOURS. Mr. Speaker, during the weeks that this Chamber has stood in recess, private citizens have continued to debate the desirability of requiring financial institutions and others to withhold the Federal tax due on interest and dividends. I am pleased to see that the withholding issue is receiving great attention in private sector debates, where true experts and objectively assessing the merits of withholding.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the views of one expert in the operations of our Nation's credit unions: John J. Hutchinson. Mr. Hutchinson, who is the president of the National Association of Federal Credit Unions (NAFCU), is also manager of Hamilton Standard Federal Credit Union in Windsor Locks, Conn. In his dual capacity as president of a national organization and also as manager of a moderate-sized credit union, Mr. Hutchinson is in the unique position to be able to address not only the public policy reasons to repeal withholding, but also the day-to-day operational reasons why withholding should be repealed.

I ask that a letter from Mr. Hutchinson, which appeared in the New York Times of November 16, be inserted at this point.

LETTERS: INTEREST AND DIVIDEND
WITHHOLDING IS BAD LAW

WASHINGTON, November 9, 1982.

To the Editor:

On behalf of the National Association of Federal Credit Unions, I must strongly dis-

agree with your Nov. 9 editorial "Withholding, in the Public Interest." Withholding of the taxes owed on interest and dividend income is not in the public interest. It is bad law and will penalize individuals who wish to save.

You state that withholding is "not a new tax." It will indeed be a new tax for a large segment of the taxpaying public.

About 75 percent of all individuals filing Federal tax returns receive refunds. Through over-withholding on their wages, these people already have the taxes due on their interest and dividend payments set aside. For them, withholding is a new tax. Also, the government will be getting an interest-free loan for several months at the expense of individuals, who will lose the benefits of compounding for some of the interest or dividends due on their accounts.

You correctly note that "the exemptions will create their own problems." The exemption system as provided under the act will be complicated and costly. It is optional, and many small financial institutions may be unable to offer exemptions because of cost burdens. In addition, it will not be easy to explain the exemption system to qualifying individuals, who will be required to file an exemption certificate with each institution from which they receive interest or dividends.

You indicate that withholding of taxes on interest and dividends will help balance the budget, but the revenue from withholding will not be as great as has been predicted.

During the debate on the 1982 tax act, the Administration argued that withholding will bring in \$4 billion in fiscal year 1983: However, this figure ignores both the exemption system and the delay in the start-up date (to July 1, 1983). As a vast number of accounts credit interest or dividends quarterly, the delay in the effective date means that for many accounts withholding will not start until the beginning of fiscal year 1984.

Furthermore, the cost to financial institutions of implementing the withholding program may well exceed the added revenues. And that cost will of necessity be passed on to savers and borrowers. This is particularly true for credit unions, which are cooperative, member-owned institutions. Thus, their members may in effect be subjected to double taxation.

You maintain that "blatant evasion undermines the whole tax system." I could not agree more. However, let's look at who is evading.

The Internal Revenue Service confirms that there is a 96.7 percent voluntary compliance rate for the reporting of taxes owed on interest and dividends from financial institution accounts and stock holdings. Financial institutions report interest and dividend income paid out to account holders on Form 1099. However, the Treasury does not have such a reporting system for the bonds, notes, etc., that it sells, and reporting compliance is much lower for holders of these obligations.

In response to your question "What substitute would the repealers propose to keep the Federal deficit from growing even larger?" we recommend that Congress require the Treasury to report to the I.R.S. the interest paid on its obligations and to send copies of the reports to the individuals receiving the payments, as financial institutions are required to do.

Financial institutions, including credit unions, are eager to do their part to support our American system and to help get the economy back on its feet, but a costly with-

holding system that will not accomplish its objectives is not the answer.

JOHN J. HUTCHINSON,
President, National Association
Of Federal Credit Unions.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud Mr. Hutchinson for the responsible manner in which he addresses the issue of withholding. As my colleagues know, I fully agree with the National Association of Federal Credit Unions that "withholding of the taxes owed on interest and dividend income is not in the public interest. It is bad law and will penalize individuals who wish to save."

Withholding on interest and dividend income is not the answer to America's financial problems. In fact, it is a classic example of "overkill." There are simpler ways of addressing the issue of tax evaders than the imposition of withholding. I urge my colleagues to commit themselves to a re-examination of this controversial issue. Any Members wishing to join with me and 66 other Members of this body in calling for the repeal of withholding on interest and dividends are invited to cosponsor H.R. 7108.●

LEGISLATION TO ESTABLISH A COMMISSION ON THE BICENTENNIAL OF THE CONSTITUTION

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to provide for the establishment of a Commission on the Bicentennial of the Constitution. The Senate passed a similar bill in the closing hours of the session that ended October first.

September 17, 1987, will mark the 200th anniversary of an important day in the world's history—the bicentennial of the day the Constitutional Convention adopted our Constitution. This bill would establish a Commission to plan appropriate celebrations for, and study events leading to, the ratification of the Constitution.

This important date is less than 5 years away. In order for any commission to fully study the important events leading up to the Constitution's ratification—the Mount Vernon Convention, for example—we need to pass this bill now, in the lame-duck session. Sometimes, I think, we tend to forget the importance of this date. Our Nation's real birthday is September 17, July 4, 1776, was the date the Declaration of Independence was signed, and who can ever forget those eloquent challenges: "We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable

rights, and that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Thus, the Declaration provided the end goal of what 13 separate and distinct Colonies would and should become. The Constitution provided the means to achieve those goals. Two hundred years from when that document was signed, we should be able to have the resources and the abilities to see how far we have come to achieve those purposes. This Commission will provide those resources and abilities to do that.

On the Centennial of the Constitution, President Grover Cleveland said:

If the American People are true to their sacred trust, another centennial day will come, and millions yet unborn will inquire concerning our stewardship and the safety of their Constitution. God grant that they may find it unimpaired, and as we rejoice today in the patriotism and devotion of those who lived 100 years ago, so may those who follow us rejoice in our fidelity and love for Constitutional liberty.

Let us start now to live up to the sacred trust Grover Cleveland spoke of in 1887. Let us pledge that millions of Americans yet unborn will celebrate the tricentennial of this historic document that gives hope and faith to all of the world. Let us begin now to plan for 1987, and for those yet to come. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this bill, and help to get it passed in the 97th Congress.●

COLONEL ROSS DAVIDSON,
HONORARY CONGRESSMAN

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to recognize the many achievements of one of Sacramento County, Calif.'s most accomplished citizens, Mr. Ross Davidson of Carmichael, a retired U.S. Air Force colonel.

To compliment a host of other "honorary" titles that have been bestowed on Colonel Davidson, it is my pleasure to designate him as Honorary Congressman from Carmichael.

Now a successful real estate developer in our community, Colonel Davidson served with the Air Force in a career that spanned 28 years and three wars. He commanded several tactical units, including Sacramento's only combat unit in southeast Asia during the Vietnam war, where his performance won him many honors, including the coveted Legion of Merit. During his career, he received 49 U.S. and foreign awards and decorations.

During his service as a combat pilot in both World War II and Vietnam, Colonel Davidson flew 87 missions, having his aircraft damaged by enemy fire during 30 of those missions.

This designated Sacramento County citizen served 6 years in exploration of

the North Polar Basin, and, along with Admiral Byrd and Admiral Peary, is a member of the world renowned Explorers Club. As deputy joint services project officer for the distant early warning line (Dewline), he was in charge of constructing and testing a \$1 billion chain of radar stations across 3,000 miles of Arctic wasteland, from Alaska to Greenland, an undertaking previously considered impossible.

While stationed at Mather and McClellan Air Force Bases in the Sacramento area and after his retirement, he has served on many governmental and civic boards and commissions, at the city, county, and State level. He has been president of two State advisory commissions and the Carmichael Chamber of Commerce.

He was the first honorary mayor of Carmichael, serving six terms, and now holds the title, honorary mayor emeritus in perpetuity. His other honorary titles include: honorary district governor of Carmichael—by the Sacramento Board of Supervisors—honorary judge for the State of California; honorary fire chief of Carmichael; honorary Sacramento County deputy sheriff; honorary watermaster of the Carmichael Water District; and honorary superior court judge for the county of Sacramento. He has also been honored in resolutions by the California State Senate and the Sacramento County Board.

In consideration of his outstanding service to his community, State, and Nation, I hereby designate Col. Ross Davidson as honorary Congressman from Carmichael.●

THE RETIREMENT OF DR.
JOSEPH SHELTON COPE, M.D.

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, November 5, 1982, Dr. Joseph Shelton Cope, M.D., retired and ended a career of 50 years of serving people in west-central Missouri.

Dr. Cope's record of service to his country and his community is one we all should strive to emulate. He received his doctorate during the Depression of the 1930's. His academic achievement earned him cum laude honors as he finished sixth in his class. He began his career of service by working in the Civilian Conservation Corps as a medical service director.

Dr. Cope also served in this country's Armed Forces. He joined the Army Reserve in 1933 and was called to active duty in 1942.

In the years since World War II, Dr. Cope has practiced his profession in a distinguished manner. He has worked in several medical organizations in-

cluding the American Medical Association and the Missouri State Medical Association. He is a fellow of the American College of Surgeons, a founding member of the Southwest Surgical Congress, a member of the Missouri State Surgical Association, and has served on the State Board of Registration for the Healing Arts. He also served recently as vice president of the Missouri State Medical Association.

With all of the honor and acclaim which has come to him through the years, it is particularly noteworthy that in a recent interview Dr. Cope stated, "My greatest honor has been to be able to take care of people who need help with the realization that I have been helpful to someone whether they can pay for my services or not."

It is my pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to join the people of Lexington in wishing Dr. Cope a long, beneficial retirement. He has served us well.●

THE GREEN MOVEMENT

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, as we convene for this short session of Congress, the plight of the unemployed worker in America is on all of our minds. Many of the solutions that have been mentioned deal with the construction of new transportation infrastructure and the maintenance of decaying existing roads and bridges. I urge my colleagues to remember that the cement and the reinforcement rods and the metal for the bridges are all products of one indispensable industry—an industry suffering today not only with the burden of a recession, but further weakened by constant attempts to shut it down by a group of Americans apparently unconcerned with the American worker. I speak of the professional environmental community in the United States.

This group has consistently mouthed concern for the poor and the economically displaced in this country, while seeking to thwart development that would better the lives of those who are at the bottom of the economic ladder. They forget that the business interests they continue to degrade are the very institutions that employ people, and allow people to better their lot in one of the last places on Earth that still allows upward mobility.

They are antimining, antipersonal automobile, antiwater projects, antinuclear power, antioil and gas drilling, antioil, and quite frankly, antihuman. They forget that God has granted this Nation a wealth of natural resources and a system that allows

people to better themselves through their own hard work. He did not intend for us to deny ourselves the wealth of our land or of our brains, yet today these groups do exactly that, by rejecting the science of geology and substituting Lysenkoism that not only rejects science, but does so at the cost of thousands of American jobs in productive enterprises. To think that a relatively small group of Americans would place a higher price on having their own playgrounds on the public lands at the expense of the economically displaced in America is unconscionable to me, and I will continue to work with the conservationists in America to reject the economic stagnation and "small is beautiful" notions of these preservationists.

I would like to insert into the RECORD a copy of a recent paper written on the "Greens" in Europe and the United States by J. Allen Overton, president of the American Mining Congress. Mr. Speaker, we cannot have jobs if we do not develop our resources.

[From the Mining Congress Journal, November 1982]

THE GREEN MOVEMENT

(By J. Allen Overton, Jr., President, American Mining Congress)

The so-called Green Movement has been on the upsurge in Northern Europe and reached its apogee to date in the recent elections in the West German state of Hesse, when it displaced the Free Democrats as the third largest party behind the two traditional leaders. If the trend continues there and elsewhere, it could portend real instability in the governance of nations.

Those whom the Europeans call the Greens began very much like the early environmentalists in the United States, and they echoed the same calls for a new dedication to ecological responsibility, which was laudable in its aims and admittedly overdue. The movement has evolved, however, into what *The Economist* recently described as a "misty mixture of anti-nuclearism, anti-growth environmentalism and incipient neulism."

The same tendency, unfortunately, is increasingly evident in this country and could produce a bad skewing of social and economic policies and the conduct of foreign affairs.

It is ironic and tragic that the same people who preach no-growth economics also proclaim their solicitude for the underprivileged and the need for a more congenial society. They speak of creating more and better jobs, humanizing the workplace, using new technologies to render life and labor more pleasant, building schools and hospitals and decent housing, and rebuilding the dilapidated parts of the nation's infrastructure.

How, one must ask, are these things to be done, if we establish a public policy of permanent stagnation? Most assuredly they will never be achieved without an abundance of minerals, yet the Greens of this country are implacable in their hostility to the mining industry.

Likewise, they affirm a fierce attachment to individual rights and political freedoms, but they have a nonchalant disregard of the national security posture needed to defend

them and a naive faith in the goodwill of America's adversaries. Consequently, the Greens feel safe and comfortable in denouncing the industrial might, military arsenal and minerals development of the nation, which are the very things that allow them to be safe and comfortable.

The sham of all this should be readily apparent, but the movement evokes warm support from the many people who yearn for simple answers in a complicated age. Moreover, it draws on enormous resources.

First, there is money, which has aptly been called "the mother's milk of politics." The myth is still fostered that the environmentalists are a ragged little band working out of storefronts, while corporations ladle out funds from fat war chests. The facts are quite different.

Many corporations are on the financial ropes today. On the other hand, a recent article in *Fortune* lists 14 organizations under the heading "The Green Lobby" and shows them to have aggregate budgets this year of \$92 million. Obviously lucre isn't considered filthy in the right hands.

These organizations are headed by full-time professionals who are highly skilled at raising money by appealing to people's best instincts and worst fears. Indeed, they have to be skilled at it, if they are to pay their own salaries.

Next there are people. The groups listed in *Fortune* have a combined membership of nearly 5½ million, highly organized and orchestrated in a network that stretches across the country and covers rural, suburban and metropolitan communities. They are devoted to their cause and diligent in advancing it, as was shown not long ago when one congressman felt the need to buttress his re-election campaign. A call for help immediately brought out 150 environmentalists to walk door to door buttonholing the voters.

These are people who vote, volunteer and push their friends to do the same. When one considers that the turnout at the polls in nonpresidential elections has dropped to nearly one-third of the eligible electorate (much less in many crucial primaries), it becomes clear that the movement exercises tremendous political clout, and the Greens are basically a one-issue pressure group that is unforgiving in applying its own strict litmus test to determine its friends and foes.

Finally, the leaders of the movement are adept in the arts of polemics and propaganda. They can be shrill and strident with denunciations and seductive with appeals, invariably managing to draw issues and choices in the most stark black and white terms. They are clever with slogans and oversimplifications and superb when it comes to manipulating the media.

A visual medium like television suits their purposes well, because it lends itself to vivid dramatizations and arguments that can be encapsulated in a 40-second film clip. Industries such as mining are hard put to respond, because often the responsible reply involves scientific studies, engineering data, economic analyses, statistical compilations, technological explanations and other things that are considered too dull or lengthy for the evening news.

The mining industry, among others, has no easy way to counter the Green Movement. I certainly have no magic formula to suggest, but can only reiterate the frequent plea that we stir ourselves to political activism and work harder at promoting public enlightenment. ●

DENSEPACK—MOVING TARGET FOR ARMS CONTROL

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, the Reagan administration's decision to base the MX missile in the Densepack basing mode marks the greatest leap into the unknown this administration has yet taken with nuclear weapons.

In effect, the administration has decided to spend \$26 billion on a basing scheme that rests on the theory of fratricide and the thin hope that the Soviets will not overcome it any time soon. I commend to my colleagues an article by R. Jeffrey Smith from the October 1982 issue of *Arms Control Today*. As Mr. Smith notes, it is only a matter of time before the Soviets would develop a way to overcome Densepack. Consequently, the Densepack deployment will only start a new round of the action-reaction arms race between the United States and the Soviet Union.

It is now incumbent on the Congress to reject Densepack because, first, it does not solve the problem of ICBM vulnerability, second, the Densepack deployment merely heats up the arms race and third, the MX missile itself is a first-strike weapon that contributes nothing to the retaliatory capacity of this country.

Mr. Smith's article follows:

[From *Arms Control Today*, October 1982]

DENSE PACK—MOVING TARGET FOR ARMS CONTROL

(By R. Jeffrey Smith)

To those who have followed all but the latest developments in the debate on the MX nuclear missile, President Reagan's forthcoming decision in favor of a basing mode known as Dense Pack may seem ridiculous. Since the late 1970's, a central justification for the MX has been the need to ensure that land-based missiles can be protected from Soviet attack. Yet it is impossible to know if the MX, deployed in Dense Pack basing, will be secure from attack.

The requirement for missile invulnerability arose from concern among some weapons experts over increased Soviet missile accuracy, which would supposedly permit the destruction of the existing Minuteman missile force in a Soviet first strike. Dense Pack is the latest in a long string of ideas conceived to address this problem. Superficially, it is an attractively simple idea. One hundred MX missiles will be deployed in 100 silos. The silos will be spaced less than 2000 feet apart, so as to increase the likelihood of so-called warhead fratricide—the tendency of one warhead to destroy or deflect another when it detonates, through the release of radiation, the production of intense pressures, or the elevation of dust and debris.

Fratricide can be avoided if the attacking warheads are timed to detonate within milliseconds of one another, a technical demand that U.S. weapons experts say the Soviets will be unable to meet for many years. It

can also be avoided through the use of only a few extremely high yield warheads capable of destroying more than one silo each. But U.S. weapons experts say that Dense Pack silos can be constructed so as to survive the effects of all but direct hits. The steel exteriors will be made to deform in response to short-term pressure peaks. Power cells and communications may be protected. Enormous amounts of sand and porous concrete will be used as shock absorbers, and a cap of earth or water may be used atop each silo opening.

There are, however, several other potential ways of defeating Dense Pack. One possibility, which the Soviets could attempt by the early 1990's, is to attack with low yield maneuvering warheads capable of pinpoint accuracy. The Air Force says that these would be vulnerable to countermeasures such as electronic jamming or a simple form of silo defense, which the United States could deploy by then.

An even better alternative, also possible in the early 1990's, is for the Soviets to use warheads that penetrate the earth or land softly on the surface. Earth penetrators avoid fratricide by simply burrowing into the earth before detonating, a tactic that minimizes the dispersal of radiation. Soft landers act as surface mines. They can be fused to detonate simultaneously, before any U.S. missiles are launched, or singly, at the moment each missile is launched. The Air Force maintains that soft landers and earth penetrators could be destroyed by a ballistic missile defense, because they must be launched in clumps and must slow considerably after reentering the earth's atmosphere. One weapons official seriously insists that earth penetrators can also be defeated by rolling tremendous boulders into the space between each silo, inhibiting penetration.

A final strategy available to the Soviets is the detonation of many warheads in a rapid sequence over the Dense Pack missile field, which would generate such a storm of radiation and blast effects that the MX could not survive after launch. It would then be feasible to drop warheads onto, say, every third silo, so that fratricide is diminished. The high-altitude detonations, or "pin-down," could be maintained until all of the MX are destroyed. Kent Johnson, a physicist at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, recently served on a Defense Department panel that analyzed "pin-down" and other attack strategies. He points out that a "pin-down" may not be in the Soviet Union's best interests, because it would require the use of many weapons and result in the destruction of only a portion of the U.S. arsenal. He notes that "there is no way of breaking the pin-down," short of disrupting the attack with a ballistic missile defense or a similar pin of Soviet silos by missiles launched from U.S. submarines. This is a remarkable suggestion, because the Air Force has previously claimed that each leg of the U.S. strategic triad must be capable of surviving on its own, and that submarines could not be depended on for quick retaliation against a Soviet attack.

The most optimistic outcome of these estimates is that some—but not all—of the MX in Dense Pack silos would survive for an hour or two. Eventually, all missiles that are not launched promptly will perish. Even this temporary survivability depends on a set of theoretical assumptions. The first of these has to do with the magnitude of fratricide. Two warheads have never been detonated simultaneously above ground, so U.S.

estimates are based entirely on computer models. The second has to do with the speed with which the Soviets can deploy threatening means of attack. Soviet technical progress can be forecast with some assurance, but the United States has been wrong in its estimates before. A third assumption is the speed with which the United States can deploy countermeasures, which depend on new inventions in difficult areas. For example, some form of ballistic missile defense will be essential to the survival of Dense Pack within a decade. Major General Stewart Meyer, a former director of the Army's BMD program, believes that construction of a successful defense will be enormously difficult because of the inherent expense and vulnerability of the radars on which such a system depends. Another assumption is that the silos will actually withstand high yield explosions. Eugene Sevin, a top scientist at the Defense Nuclear Agency, believes that the requisite silo hardening "is probably workable." But he cautions that realistic tests of a superhard silo will be impossible. He says that any decision on Dense Pack will be "highly judgmental."

The Air Force response to this uncertainty is to emphasize the flexibility of Dense Pack: more silos can eventually be constructed to deceive Soviet targeters. A missile defense can be constructed in 1989 if necessary, Air Force officials say. Only two conclusions seem possible amidst such speculation: first, that construction of a Dense Pack will draw the United States and the Soviet Union into a new spiraling arms race, as one side reacts and the other attempts to anticipate the reaction; and second, tensions could develop at any point if the United States stumbles and the Soviets advance.

All of the uncertainties extend to the diplomatic arena as well. Dense Pack may violate provisions in the unratified SALT II treaty barring the construction of new missile silos. But the Administration intends to assert that the silos are not silos at all, but merely missile shelters, or temporary resting places for missiles that are inherently mobile. The Soviets will protest, with good reason. No one knows how this dispute will affect the ongoing START negotiations. Similarly, deployment of a missile defense will violate provisions in SALT I requiring it to be located either at Grand Forks, N.D., or Washington, D.C. The Air Force is optimistic that the Soviets will agree to an amendment transferring the permissible missile defense from Grand Forks to the Dense Pack location, wherever it may be. No one can predict what concessions the Soviets will seek in return.

Why is the Administration willing to spend \$25 billion (in constant dollars, not including missile defense costs) on a system of uncertain political or strategic value? The answer is that, despite a contrary public impression, the Pentagon believes the MX is valuable even if these predictions are all wrong—even if the MX cannot survive in Dense Pack basing. This becomes evident from a close study of congressional testimony on the MX.

In 1976, for example, members of Congress asked Pentagon officials if concern for the vulnerability of existing ICBMs was the primary factor pacing MX development. No, the Pentagon said. The primary pacing factor was the increasing invulnerability of Soviet targets, a circumstance that could best be addressed by the MX's increased accuracy. The missile is, in short, necessary for the United States to destroy hardened Soviet targets—a mission of dubious impor-

tance if the United States is interested only in retaliation. Verne Orr, the current Air Force Secretary, is unabashed in this regard. "Today, in the ballistic missile age of nuclear weaponry and in the absence of an effective ABM system, the 'only' defence against nuclear attack is a strong offense," he wrote recently in Air Force magazine.

In a slightly different vein, General Lewis Allen, the former Air Force Chief of Staff, testified last year that invulnerability was a needless requirement for MX that constructing a vulnerable target was sufficient to advance U.S. interests. "If the system required the Soviets to disarm themselves [by expending attacking warheads] then that system did the job we wanted it to do," Allen said with reference to previous MX basing plans. "That is, it changed the balance in such a way that the Soviets could no longer face us with this great superiority of ICBMs." It is apparently not worrisome that a successful Soviet attack could make \$25 billion go up in smoke. What Allen seeks is a nuclear sponge to soak up Soviet warheads, solely to redress an alleged imbalance in the number and lethality of weapons held by the Soviets and the United States.

This view is widely shared in Washington, and is gaining wide support in the Congress. Representative Samuel Stratton, a Democrat from New York, was instrumental recently in getting the House to approve production of the first five MX missiles, despite the lack of any assurance that they can be protected from attack. Stratton, who chairs a subcommittee on military nuclear systems, said on the House floor that "the statement is frequently being made that we do not have an invulnerable method of basing, and therefore we somehow have to wait until the Pentagon can develop an invulnerable method of basing. I think we have gotten a little too dependent on our scientists. . . . If we are going to insist on absolute perfection in the basing modes of our missiles we are asking the impossible. . . . I think we ought to disabuse ourselves of the idea that we have to have something invulnerable when it comes to MX."

Stratton wants the MX mainly because the existing U.S. ICBM—the Minuteman—is dwarfed in size by existing Soviet missiles. Before the recent House vote, he arranged for models of these missiles to be placed outside the chamber. "I say to the members, particularly those who are not here in the chamber, before you vote, do not vote until you go out in the Speaker's lobby and take a look once again at those Soviet missiles," he said. "That is a true image of the relative sizes of our two missiles, and what we are talking about is providing an adequate defense against the Soviet SS-18, the SS-17, and the SS-19." The size of the MX, in and of itself, is justification for its deployment, to Stratton's way of thinking. If the Soviets have big missiles, we must have them too, even if they are vulnerable to attack.

Key officials at the White House also believe the missile is valuable if it cannot survive. William Clark, the President's national security adviser, stated last May that the modernization of land-based strategic forces "is too important to allow the risk of technical, environmental, or arms-control debates to delay the introduction of the missile into the force." Similarly, Thomas Reed, a former Air Force Secretary who serves on the National Security Council, stated in June that "the President views the production of a new, larger, more accurate, and more easily maintained ICBM, with the earliest possible introduction into the oper-

ational force, as absolutely essential . . . we must have a steady, ongoing ICBM program without turbulence." Turbulence, in Reed's view, is created by excessive concern about the ability of the MX to survive a Soviet assault. Both Clark and Reed have stated that MX basing in existing, highly vulnerable silos is acceptable if secure basing cannot be found.

Critics of the MX will learn this December that Dense Pack is an elusive target. There are grave uncertainties about its ability to provide sufficient protection. But this is not really a fruitful topic of debate, as the Pentagon and the White House do not really care about missile invulnerability. The MX is no longer thought of as a solution to the problem of decreased Minuteman survivability, if it ever was. There are other, darker reasons for its construction, the most important being the capability it gives the United States to fight a nuclear war.

This is what the arms control community must explore with the public between now and the day of the President's announcement. It is going to be an uphill battle. ●

**ELEANOR ROBLES MONTANO
HONORED BY THE WILMINGTON
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE**

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with distinct pleasure that I take this opportunity to pay tribute to Eleanor Robles Montano, who is being honored by the Wilmington Chamber of Commerce on December 1. Indeed, Eleanor's many accomplishments and contributions to the area have made her worthy of such an honor.

Eleanor was born in Long Beach, Calif., and was educated both there and in neighboring Wilmington. After graduating from Phineas Banning High School in Wilmington, she began her service to the community by working in St. Mary's Hospital in Long Beach for 2 years. Later, she married Emilio Montano and began raising her family of five children. Eleanor and Emilio are also foster parents to seven boys.

During these years, Eleanor began a hobby which has grown into what is today a successful business: cake decorating. Not only does Eleanor teach cake decorating, but she also serves as a judge for cake shows every year. She attended Bixby Knolls Park School and Edith Gates School of Cake Decorating, as well as taking graduate courses on cake decorating from Mexican, Australian, English, and South African masters. Related to her interest in this field, Eleanor is a member of the Sweet Arts Cake Club, the Retail Bakers of America, the California Cake Club, and the Fancy Frosters Cake Club, of which she is a past president.

Aside from her interest in cake decorating, Eleanor Montano has done ex-

tensive work in her community. Among her many activities, she is a member of the Harbor Community Police Task Force, the board of directors for the Boys Club of Wilmington, the Harbor Area Police Community Council, and the Wilmington Chamber of Commerce, of which she was program chairman and ways and means chairman. She is a member of three PTA's. Eleanor is a former vice president and is now president of the Los Angeles Police Department LITES, as well as being vice president and program chairman of the community support program. In this capacity, Eleanor has presented programs which have been televised and include such topics as "Gangs and What Is Being Done About Them," "Senior Citizen Rip-Offs" and "Crusade Against Crime in the Schools."

Quite deservedly, Eleanor was named Wilmington's Citizen of the Year in 1980, and is Wilmington's 1982 outgoing honorary mayor.

But to merely list Eleanor's activities would not do justice to her truly outstanding and tireless dedication to her community. My wife, Lee, and I have known Eleanor for many years, and we can only wonder how she finds enough hours in a day to contribute so much to both her community and her family. Indeed, Eleanor Montano is a truly remarkable woman.

Mr. Speaker, in light of Eleanor Montano's outstanding and continuing contributions to her community. I know you and my colleagues will join me in paying tribute to this most deserving and distinguished woman. My wife, Lee, joins me in wishing Eleanor Robles Montano, her husband Emilio, and their five children, Ricardo, Marina, Loretta, Mario, and Jaime only the best in the years ahead. ●

TAYLOR'S FUTURE AT STAKE

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I very much want to bring to my colleagues' attention the challenge facing the residents of my hometown, Taylor, Mich. Like last year at this time, my constituents must choose whether to pass a millage and keep their schools open for the full academic year or put their 14,300 students' futures in jeopardy and put the plans of their graduating seniors in limbo.

Last year, the Taylor schools made national headlines with their plight. Many of the doomsayers predicted that Taylor residents, already suffering from the ravages of the highest unemployment in the Nation, severe inflation, and far-reaching State budget cuts would turn thumbs down

on the millage proposal. But I am extremely proud that my constituents met that challenge and set a precedent for several other Michigan school districts encountering similar fiscal dilemmas.

Many of the same factors which constituted last year's critical millage scenario remain: a sound economic prediction that the State will face a significant shortfall in revenue during this fiscal year; the constitutional requirement for a balanced budget; and the contention by the Governor, speaker of the house, senate majority leader, and the minority leaders of both houses in the State legislature that there will be no "bailout" for suffering local school districts.

And, our respected Attorney General, Frank Kelley, stands by his statement of last year:

... the financial fate of the local school district is in the hands of local voters.

The Michigan Constitution does not impose a duty on the Michigan Legislature to appropriate additional State funds to those school districts where the electors have refused to approve property tax limitation increases for school operating purposes. It is a mistake for anyone to believe that the State has funds available for aid to school districts which run out of funds.

Unless the 5.4 mills are renewed, the schools will be closed by April. Our community cannot afford to let its children have any less education and opportunity than other cities in Wayne County or the State. Our reputation as a quality place to live, do business and raise one's family cannot withstand the defeat of this millage and the subsequent closing of schools.

Michigan's long-time respected tradition of local control must be maintained. It is a policy I fought for as a young attorney for the then-Taylor Township schools, as a delegate to the State constitutional convention, as a State senator, and one I am committed to as a senior, ranking member of the House Education and Labor Committee in the U.S. House of Representatives.

The December 6 millage vote gives the Taylor voters another opportunity to maintain and enrich this important commitment to "local control." It gives them the prerogative of insuring that their children and my grandchildren receive the same chance for a successful future that we had. I strongly believe that the voters cannot afford to shut the school doors and rob their children of just 1 year of education. It could very well mean the difference between success or failure in many students' educational careers or even lifetime success.

When Taylor residents went to the polls last year, many questioned the viability of their school district. Since then, with the strong support and expert assistance of State Superintendent of Public Instruction Phillip

E. Runkel and his staff, the Taylor schools have made significant improvements in many practices. And, in that very thorough report, the State department staff found several "good things happening" in the Taylor schools.

Undeniably, the passage of the millage makes good sense for the future of our children, but it also makes good economic sense. If the millage is not approved, Taylor could well be the only municipality in the entire State without public schools. The dire consequences this would have on home values, and on the ability of our mayor and city council to retain and attract business would be devastating. The issues are clear. It is now up to the voters to decide the future of our children and our community.●

MX MISSILE

HON. LES AU COIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. AU COIN. Mr. Speaker, if war is peace, if an arms race is arms control, then the President is right that the MX missile is a "peacekeeper." But none of those things is true, and the President is reckless and wrong.

The MX missile shatters the informal agreement of the superpowers to abide by the terms of the SALT II Treaty. It depends on a basing system that no one knows will work. It may cause the abrogation of the ABM treaties. It will cost billions upon billions of dollars when the economy is staggering under a \$200 billion deficit and millions are out of work. It escalates the arms race when a huge majority of Americans in nine States voted on November 2 for a mutual, verifiable nuclear weapons freeze.

The President's speech on November 22 should offend all Americans for its oversimplifications. The President tried to make it seem that U.S. defenses are inferior to the Soviet Union's. But even members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have said they would not trade America's defenses for the Soviet Union's.

The Soviet Government is in transition—a priceless opportunity for the United States. But there was absolutely nothing in the President's speech that gave an opening that would exploit this opportunity for peace.

Thus, it was a dangerous speech and the MX decision is a dangerous decision. Now there will be a furious battle in Congress over the MX. It will be close because despite overwhelming opposition across the country, no President has ever been denied a major weapon he sought. It is imperative that we do so now.

I will be among those in Congress who will fight the MX missile. Every-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

one who supported and voted for the nuclear weapons freeze must now focus their energies on stopping the funding of this unnecessary, costly, and reckless weapon.●

HONORING EVON CODY

HON. CHARLES PASHAYAN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. PASHAYAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues that on December 11, Mr. Evon Cody will end nearly three decades of public service in Kings County, Calif.

Born and raised in Kings County, Evon began his public service as a member of the Kings County Planning Commission. He was elected to the board of supervisors in June 1954 and has served continuously since then.

Evon has been most active as a member of the board, serving as president of the San Joaquin Valley Supervisors Association, and as a director for the California Supervisors Association. Since 1975 he has served on the Governor's Employment Services Board.

His public service has included the Kings County Red Cross, State Tuberculosis Association, Salvation Army Board, YMCA, Outreach Boy's Ranch, Community Hospital, Kings County Symphony and Art League, as well as numerous other charitable organizations. Additionally, Evon has been very active in both the Kings County Farm Bureau and Navy League and has served as lieutenant governor of the Kiwanis Club International.

During Evon's tenure as supervisor, he was actively engaged in the development of the greenbelt concept, which protects the integrity of the LeMoore Naval Air Station, the development of the county park system, and, as an expression of his concern for orderly development, was a strong supporter of a general plan that protects both the urban and rural interests of the county.

Also, Evon has been a strong supporter of city-county cooperation, evidenced by consolidation of library and fire services and numerous other agreements with the various cities that resulted in providing a more efficient delivery of specific services.

Evon was instrumental in assuring that Kings County's space requirements were met well into the future. The county's space needs will be met for many years to come with the development of a government center in Hanford, as well as government centers in Corcoran, Avenal, and LeMoore. He played an active role in modernizing the fire department from the standpoint of both facilities and equipment.

November 29, 1982

Evon and his wife Marie have been married 48 years. They have two children, Carol and Robin, and two grandchildren.●

THE DEATH OF JOHN WILLIAM CARTER

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, recently, I was saddened to learn of the death of a long-time acquaintance in my hometown. John William Carter died Sunday, October 31 in Lexington, Mo.

Mr. Carter was a respected member of his community. He had served for years as an instructor and administrator in a local school. He was an active member of his church and of the Masons. He served as a trustee of the Forest Grove Cemetery. The community has benefited from the life of Mr. Carter and shares the loss of his passing with his wife and daughter.●

HONORING MRS. SUNNY RABENSTOCK

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, the 370,000 women of Hadassah are solely responsible for the Hadassah Medical Organization and the Hadassah hospitals in Israel. Diligently supporting the national organization, the Arrowhead Chapter of Hadassah has, with great pride, provided needed equipment in Hadassah hospitals. Annually, the Arrowhead Chapter honors a woman whose contribution to the organization has been particularly outstanding. This year, I would like to join with the Arrowhead Chapter of Hadassah, and honor Sunny Rabenstock for her tireless efforts on behalf of the people of Israel and for her selfless service to her community.

Sunny has been instrumental in the success enjoyed by Hadassah. At the local level, she has served for many years as a board member, as well as serving as chapter president for 2 years. In addition, she was secretary of the Southern California Regional Board.

An active member of her community, Sunny has demonstrated extensive capabilities as a member of the San Bernardino Unified School District Budget Committee, and as a senior counselor at Juvenile Hall. She has been president of the Jewish War Veterans' Auxiliary, president of the Sisterhood of Congregation Emanu-El,

and has served as a member of the Temple's board of directors and secretary of the congregation as well.

An achiever in the best sense of the word, Sunny received her B.A. in education from Brooklyn College and her law degree from Brooklyn Law School. She later practiced law in New York City. Sunny is currently a legal assistant.

Sunny and her husband, Norman, reside with their children, Steven and Robin, in San Bernardino, Calif.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and admiration that I recognize and commend Sunny Rabenstock to the House of Representatives.●

HARRY E. FIGGIE, JR.—SUCCESS SHARED

HON. RONALD M. MOTT

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, there are many elements in a success story, but one main theme can be read clearly. To be truly successful, one must share the experience. Harry E. Figgie is a man with much to share for he is a success in every sense of the word.

In 1964 Harry, a fifth generation Clevelander, took charge of the small automatic sprinkler firm. Under his guidance, the company has evolved into Figgie International, formerly A-T-O Inc., a company boasting over \$750 million in sales last year and made up of over 30 divisions including such familiar names as Rawlings Sporting Goods and American LaFrance. Harry is currently Chairman and Chief Executive officer of the company that bears his name as well as member of the board of directors of the Western Union Corp., a position he has held since 1966.

Harry Figgie is also man of education, which is perhaps why he has chosen this medium to share his knowledge and experience. Harry holds a degree in metallurgical engineering from Case Institute of Technology which he received after a stint in the infantry in World War II, an M.B.A. from Harvard Business School, and both a J.D. law degree from Cleveland Marshall Law School and a master's degree in industrial engineering from Case which he completed at night, while working full time.

Harry holds two honorary degrees. One is from Garfield Senior College and the other is from the American College of Switzerland for his commitment to economic education and free enterprise. This commitment to economic education is clear and comes at a time when such information is sorely needed.

He extends his knowledge and experience to others through lectures to

graduate students at Harvard, Northwestern, the University of Virginia, and Case Western Reserve and through economic education programs for teachers. The teaching programs, which Harry was instrumental in creating, are extensive. Over 330 teachers from across the country have been trained in the last 5 years with the help of Figgie International.

Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I ask you to join with me in paying tribute and thanks to Harry E. Figgie, Jr., a successful man sharing that success with his country.●

THE CONGRESSIONAL SALARY FREEZE ACT OF 1982

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, unless we take decisive action during these closing days of the 97th Congress, Members of the House and the Senate will receive an automatic pay raise starting in January 1983.

With the current severe recession we are experiencing throughout our country, it would be unconscionable for Congress to provide itself with a pay increase. With unemployment lines as long as those during the Great Depression, I find it unacceptable for Congress to raise its own salary.

Our energies should be focused on getting the economy back to full health again, rather than on concern for our own compensation.

It is in this spirit that today I have introduced the Congressional Salary Freeze Act of 1982. This legislation would hold the rate of salary payable to Members of Congress at current levels. Americans in all walks of life have agreed to wage freezes and pay cuts; in all fairness, Congress should do the same.●

THE NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL, INC., HONORS F. EUGENE PURCELL, CHAIRMAN OF THE WASHINGTON GROUP

HON. ANTHONY TOBY MOFFETT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, the New England Council, Inc., a regional trade association which represents 1,200 companies in the region employing over a million employees, is honoring Mr. F. Eugene Purcell for his outstanding service as the chairman of the council's Washington group, a committee of Washington based business executives of New England companies.

Gene serves as senior vice president, public affairs, for Lone Star Industries, which is based in Connecticut and is one of the largest manufacturers and distributors of concrete and cement products in the country. He joined the company in 1971 as vice president and assistant to the president, becoming vice president—corporate affairs in 1973. In his present position, to which he was appointed in 1978, he is responsible for corporate communications, office administration, and employee and labor relations.

A native of Las Vegas, N. Mex., Gene Purcell earned his bachelor of science and master of science from New Mexico Highlands University and a juris doctors degree from the University of Baltimore. He served in the military from 1951 to 1954 and currently holds a reserve commission as captain in the U.S. Air Force Reserve.

Active in industry affairs, Mr. Purcell serves on the board of directors of the Public Affairs Council and is a member of the Washington Affairs Committee of the Portland Cement Association. He has also served as trustee for the Connecticut Public Expenditures Council.

Since Gene Purcell was highly instrumental in the success of opening the council's Washington office and establishing the Washington Group, a brief description of these activities gives some idea of Gene's efforts and energies on behalf of the council's Washington office. The following is an excerpt from the November issue of the Council Report.

One year ago the New England Council, Inc. opened the doors of its Washington Office with an ambitious goal: to bring the concerns and legislative needs of the Council's 1,200 member business interests to prominence in the Capital.

A year later the Council's Washington base of operations has achieved major success on several fronts, but chiefly as a strong link between the region's business leaders, who forge Council policies, and Congressional and White House leaders, who form national policy.

Opportunities for dialogue, debate and influential exchange are numerous for Council members acutely aware of the need to meet with their lawmakers in Washington as well as at home.

In addition to increased individual contact with Congressional offices, the Washington Office, under the direction of Jeanne Campbell, Vice President, who formerly served in both leadership and New England Congressional offices, provided several forums for Council members to maximize their government relations and public affairs efforts.

The Washington Group is a linchpin in the critical process that allows Council policies to play a dynamic part in the legislative process. The Washington Group is representative of the Council's broad base of support from a wide business and industrial spectrum.

Washington Group participants, whose number is necessarily limited, meet quarterly to coordinate lobbying efforts on behalf of Council positions, share legislative intelli-

gence, spot bills key to the region, and assess their chances for passage. The Group, a Washington reflection of the strength of The Council as a coalition, caps each business meeting with a reception and dinner, inviting a member of the New England delegation to meet one-on-one with Council members and address The Group off the record. Guests to date include Senator Warren Rudman and Congressmen Jim Shannon, Dave Emery and Joe Moakley, all of whom shared timely and valuable perspectives on legislation decisive to the region's economy.

The Council entered its second year in a new D.C. location. In August, of 1982 The Council set up shop in Suite 510, 1800 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., within the law offices of Herrick & Smith, a leading New England law firm. Herrick & Smith, will assist The Council in identifying and analyzing national and local legislative issues important to the business community.

With The Council providing a continuing Washington presence, business can parlay its past—as a preeminent region where both politics and commerce began—and position its future—as a strong, rich and textured region that offers substantial rewards to those who live and work in New England.

Mr. Speaker, I bring Gene Purcell's efforts to the attention of my colleagues and commend the council for honoring his work as chairman of the Washington Group.●

MISS PORT OF LOS ANGELES— 1981-82

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to honor someone who has done a fine job of representing the Port of Los Angeles for the past year—lovely Marlise Ricardos, Miss Port of Los Angeles 1981-82.

Miss Ricardos, born and raised in San Pedro, graduated from San Pedro High School in 1979. At the Miss Port of Los Angeles Pageant on October 10, 1981, Miss Ricardos was chosen to represent the port as the new Miss Port of Los Angeles, a title she has held for the past year. Miss Ricardos never failed to live up to the busy pace of her new role, and, indeed, brought her own unique personality and excitement to the job.

Beginning with the 1981-82 harbor holidays, where she was officially introduced as the new Miss Port of Los Angeles, Miss Ricardos was kept very busy attending many dinners and other events. Her first official appearances as Miss Port were in the 1981 San Pedro Christmas Parade and in the grand marshall's boat in the Harbor Christmas Afloat. Later, she represented the Port of Los Angeles by riding on a float at the 1982 Rose Parade, and was a contestant in the 1982 Miss California Pageant.

The celebration of anniversaries also kept Marlise Ricardos in the public

eye. In a reception aboard the *Sea Princess* during her maiden voyage, Miss Ricardos helped celebrate Matson Lines' 100 years of service. The Port of Los Angeles' 75th anniversary, held at the American President Lines terminals provided another opportunity for Miss Ricardos to assist in the festivities.

Miss Ricardos is currently majoring in drama at U.S.C.'s School of Performing Arts, and recently appeared in a production of "Grease." I applaud the initiative and hard work of this talented young woman, and, with my wife Lee, wish Marlise Ricardos all the best in pursuing her chosen career.●

CZECHOSLOVAK SOCIETY HOLDS WORLD CONGRESS

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, during the recent recess, the University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa., was the site of a most impressive convocation of scholars, artists, musicians, and writers.

It was the 11th world congress of the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences and was held over the weekend of October 28-31.

The society is a nonpartisan, non-profit organization of 1,600 members, dedicated to the principles of free search for truth and knowledge and the free dissemination of ideas. They come from the ranks of refugees who fled Czechoslovakia after the Nazi occupation in 1939, the Communist coup in 1948 and the invasion of the Warsaw pact powers in 1968.

The organization of these intellectuals and professional people began in 1958 under the leadership of the late Prof. Vaclav Hlavaty, a mathematician at the University of Indiana, and Dr. Jaroslav Nemec of the National Library of Medicine.

Bound by the common purpose of advancing Czechoslovak culture, research, and scholarship in an atmosphere of freedom, the Society held its first congress in April 1962, here in Washington, D.C.

Since then, the society has met biannually throughout the United States with interim congresses at Switzerland, Canada, and Los Angeles, Calif.

It has made its presence known throughout the world. In the West, its establishment has been welcomed and supported over the past 24 years. However, comments in the controlled press of Czechoslovakia range from outright condemnation to reluctant acknowledgment of its significance.

The society has local chapters scattered throughout the United States and abroad. Its members teach at ap-

proximately 100 colleges and universities in the United States, Canada, and Western Europe.

From its inception, the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences has maintained its nonpolitical character, refusing to become an instrument of the so-called cold war. Its membership is opposed to any totalitarian ideology of either the left or the right, being fully aware that culture and freedom are inseparable.

Mr. Speaker, I deem it appropriate and proper to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this recognition of the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences for the attention of my colleagues.●

NORTHRIDGE ALL-STAR GIRLS ROSTER

HON. BOBBI FIEDLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention and I would like to bring it to the attention of the Members of the House, that the Senior Girls All Stars, who won the State championship, come from my hometown.

I believe these young women and their coaches and parents deserve the recognition of the Congress. Therefore, I am today placing in our official RECORD their names and their record.

NORTHRIDGE ALL-STAR GIRLS ROSTER

Kim Bernstein, catcher.
Joanne DeFrisco, center field.
Chrissy DeSantis, 3rd base.
Rochelle Dicker, 1st base.
Amy Himber, pitcher.
Jennifer Goodman, pitcher and 1st base.
Carina Katurich, pitcher.
Carol MacGregor, out field.
Sandra Martin, pitcher.
Stephanie Rimginton, 2nd base.
Renee Rosenbaum, out field.
Karen Secky, short stop.
Stacy Tobias, out field.
Christine Valentini, left field and short stop.

Manager, Bill Peel.
Coaches—Reggie Peel, Jon Goodman, Cheryl McDonald, Jerry Slaton, Spiro Chialtas.

Scores:
Sectional in Venice—Northridge vs.:
Glendale, lost 6-5.
North Venice, won 13-2.
San Valley, won 12-7.
Glendale, won 8-2.
Glendale, won 9-6.
Divisional in Hawthorne—Northridge vs.:
Temple City, won 4-1.
Wiseburn, won 15-12.
Wiseburn, won 3-1.
Western Regional in Pittsburg, Calif.—
Northridge vs.:
Rose City, lost 8-2.
Sunnyside, won 7-5.
Red Bluff, won 9-5.
Rose City, lost 12-3.

I am proud of what these young women have accomplished and wish them the best of luck in the coming season.●

A GREAT DAY FOR BARRE

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, on October 23, 1982, the citizens of Barre, Mass., dedicated their town hall.

This event was especially significant because on January 6, 1981, the town hall was seriously damaged by fire. The fire presented the people of Barre with the considerable challenge of rebuilding their town hall. It was a challenge to which they responded with the kind of effort and commitment that has characterized Barre since its inception. The town hall reconstruction project became a matter of civic pride, and the results are certainly worthy of pride. The town hall has been beautifully and painstakingly returned to its status as an historic site. It stands as not only the focus of the town's civic attention, but as a monument to the love of its people for their community.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Town Hall Rebuilding Committee Chairman Gerard Gariepy, the members of his committee, and the people of Barre on their achievement. I also want to include at this point in the RECORD an article from the Barre Gazette which details the rebuilding effort.

[From the Barre Gazette, Oct. 20, 1982]

FROM THE ASHES A MASTERPIECE IS HEWN
(By Dorothy Banks)

When the Town Hall burned in January of 1981 no one realized what the months ahead would involve or who would be involved in the reconstruction. The focus of this article will be on the reconstruction and those involved, especially on two men whose part in the rebuilding of this structure was crucial to bringing Barre's Town house back to the stately historic site it once was and thanks to them, now is.

David Robinson was first brought to our attention though the Town Hall Rebuilding Committee Chairman Gerard Gariepy. Gerry gave me a tour of the Town Hall as work was progressing this summer.

"He's a real take charge guy," said Gerry of Dave as we went inside. He had to order special wide-pine boards of the wainscoting which runs two feet up the wall in every room. They were beaded too, for the period look of the 1800's which Robinson was effectively recreating. The wainscoting in the Grange Hall on the upper floor had to be completely replaced whereas downstairs it had been hidden by panelling and was thus painstakingly refurbished.

Gerry praised Dave repeatedly for his attention to detail, and as we continued to tour the rest of the building right up to the massive timbers in the roof and cupola I began to get a sense of the men who were behind it all.

Shortly thereafter I repeated the tour with Dave Robinson, a handsome man of 28 years, six feet tall and curly blond hair and a mustache and beard tinged with red. He is a rugged and proud man but not at all boastful. He had agreed to do a job and put his skill and attention to every phase of it.

Dave was appointed verbally through the selectmen with the agreement of Utica Insurance as the general contractor to oversee all phases of the reconstruction of the Town Hall. In fact the insurance company was the actual general contractor. To clear any doubt as to money involved Dave was paid an hourly rate. There was "no gravy involved," commented Dave's brother, William Robinson whose own involvement I'll touch on later. "Contractor's usually get 5 percent," he continued, "Dave got nothing." And that's how he wanted it.

When Dave took on the job he and his brother Bill who, for clarification's sake was appointed clerk of the works by the insurance company, sat down and studied the blueprints. They then had to talk bids with different companies and they went to extremes to come up with the best deal they could for the town.

"A lot of people donated to the whole thing," Dave said. And by this he meant time and materials as well as effort. He mentioned Tommy Thompson of Manufacturer's Millwork in Auburn who had the oak floors brought in from Arkansas at his own expense. He praised his father, J. Warner Robinson of Hardwick who had made the "circle in a square" design, two of which are on the top of each side of every door casing. At first he had made 12 and Dave told him he needed two dozen more. Dave soon had two dozen more and no money was involved.

"My brother has donated more than anyone," Dave said. "Bill has gone to extremes to get wholesale prices (for materials) and he never took a commission."

Bill, who owns W. R. Robinson Lumber Co. in Barre, is, like his younger brother, handsome and rugged and a man of unquestionable values. He simplifies his involvement in the reconstruction by saying "I felt bad when the building burned, . . . but once I said I would do something," he adds unquestionably, "I did."

So with these two men behind it all the process of reconstruction began—

On May 4, 1981 the cupola was lowered to the sidewalk in front of the Town Hall.

"It was a scary situation," Bill Robinson recalled when he and Dave learned that the cupola was going to be taken down. No actual measurements had been taken, only estimates had been written down by the architects, Millete & Hovsepian of Worcester and those were done by looking at a photo. So Bill and Dave got together the night before the cupola was removed and Dave went up and took his own measurements on little scraps of paper. It was through these measurements that the cupola base was repaired and it is to the Robinsons' credit that those measurements were taken. It was learned later that the measurements the architectural firm had taken were wrong as a result of the distortion being taken from a photo. They were 13 feet short in height. The roof of the Town Hall would have been incorrect too. Dave wisely chose also to follow his own detailed sketches of the molding and pitch of the roof line.

When Leo's Construction Co. of Webster finished their job of removing the debris, the Robinsons' job had long since begun. Plans were underway.

The roof and cupola base were carefully designed with massive beams for supports.

Bill Robinson had donated these. This type of construction used throughout the building was called mortice and tennon. Once a common form of building technique used in the 19th century, the timbers interlock the wood by exact cuts of each piece which then allows one piece to fit snugly into the other, similar to post and beam construction.

Work continued throughout the summer.

Howard Hastings, another local artisan applied his exact carpentry craft to the cupola and the clock. Robert "Bob" Bentley was in charge of having the clock repaired and both did their jobs well. Howard told me that the cupola was not that badly damaged. His main task came in refurbishing the clock. He says that he got his ideas on the new clock faces and the louvers beneath by looking at other clocks in the towns of Petersham, Hubbardston and Templeton.

He decided on pine boards for the face of the clock, again donated by Bill Robinson. The faces needed a long-lasting covering. "The best way to do it," Howard said, "was to use painted crushed black glass called smaltz." Although it was time-consuming and more expensive, "It is cost effective in the long run," Howard indicated as it can't fade. He noted that one sign painter in Worcester was the only source he could find. With other dealers Howard recalled them saying, "Oh, Yeah, I remember using that 20 years or so ago."

The numbers on the clock were made of anodized aluminum and were made in the shop of Barre's selectman Earl N. Sample. Earl donated the use of the machinery and tools needed. The ones using them to complete the careful job of balancing the hands were Alan Dextradeur and Charles Payne. Valerie Dextradeur, Nancy Thorng and Betsy Clarkson were the ones who hand-filed and de-burred the Roman numerals for the clock to make them smooth. Earl also donated the stainless steel pulley and bracket for the flag pole "and, after considerable thought managed to find a suitable 'ball fixture' for the very top of the flag pole." I understand Earl was quite flushed after this accomplishment.

The clock was donated to the town from the First Parish Community Church during the Barre Bicentennial and the church trustees have maintained the clock, have paid for its repair and will continue to pay for its maintenance.

The cupola, while grounded, got a new copper roof and Bill Robinson here is quick to praise Utica Insurance. "Just because the insurance company picked up the tab doesn't mean we needed frills," Robinson stated. "The insurance company treated the town real well," he continued. Utica gave the town the go ahead on the copper roof, air-conditioning for the offices downstairs, and the hardwood floors on the first floor rather than inlaid. "The insurance company treated the town fairly and I'd like more people to realize that," Bill concluded.

John Paulson, Assistant Secretary of Property Claims for Utica Nationwide returned the compliment in a phone conversation in August and directed one himself towards the elder Robinson. "I think the town of Barre is lucky to have a Bill Robinson." He noted the unusual circumstances of the townspeople wanting to get involved. He added that with Bill there was "no hassle. He always had the interest of the town first," Paulson said. "We (Utica) gave so much because we got a fair shake with Bill cutting the costs," he concluded.

Paulson, who has 25 years experience in claims, estimated that because of Bill and

Dave's diligence in getting the best for the least, Utica realized a savings of between \$150,000 to \$175,000. (Although a few bills are still outstanding the cost of rebuilding, according to Paulson, is slightly in excess \$405,000.) I would mention at this point that both Dave and Selectman Chairman J. Howard Thompson had both given me a rough figure of savings that they thought was about \$20,000. Their modest figure only reinsures the knowledge that it was dedicated men who brought the town hall back to its modern stature in an old-fashioned motif.

Thus as progress visibly continued throughout the summer on the outside, progress within was also taking shape.

The offices downstairs were completely renovated first with Town Clerk Alice Orzulak and Tax Collector Alice Heyes delighted to be back in their old place again by mid-summer. As those offices were modernized the real intricate part of bringing the rest of the building into an 1800 design was going on.

Robert "Bob" Duval handled the plumbing and effectively so. Bob said the most difficult part of his job was breaking up and removing the concrete floor to get to the old pipes. He and his son, Bob A. Duval, and son-in-law Jeff Mitchell, accomplished this through use of a jackhammer.

On all levels of the Town House the plumbing is now brand new.

As mentioned before the wainscoting was carefully restored. The doorcasings needed to be replaced and G&H Woodworking of Worcester was able to do the fluted design needed to bring them back to their original form. They also reproduced the moldings for both the interior and exterior of the building throughout. Dave noted that there were 13 layers of paint on the inside moldings that had to be removed.

The doors themselves that needed replacement were made in Dave's shop by one of his carpenters, Diony Van Gerven. The two inside doors of the Town Hall leading into the auditorium are especially noteworthy as Dave took the time to see that these gracefully curved doors were repaired exactly. It would have been much simpler to put standard straight doors in, but again Dave's concern for detail would not allow him to make that sacrifice.

The front entrances to the left and right of the main doors both had to be replaced and the craftsmanship in each is remarkable. Each door is made up of 115 pieces. 115! The mortice and tennon technique is used here, too, on these raised-panel doors.

The light fixtures were taken from the Henry Woods Building and installed. These copper-toned fixtures had been in storage in the Henry Woods Building for some time. Dave said that John LaPierre, the electrician was "easy to work with." You might want to note that the wall-plates for the sockets also match the paint color in each main room, impressing again the care to detail that was given.

The curving staircases, one that had been used and now another that has been made usable on the opposite side of each front entryway, were both heavily damaged by rain. Dave preserved what he could and made new treads where necessary. The finished staircases with their rich wood banisters and shining wood steps are beautifully done.

Dave had a crew working with him that appeared as devoted to this particular job as Gerry Garipey indicated when he said,

"Dave's made sure everyone put their heart into it."

Doug Morrison a painting contractor of North Brookfield was always cheerful, always busy when I stopped by periodically to see the progress inside. "Doug has done a tremendous job," said Dave in high praise. Doug saw to it that the painting was done to Dave's specifications if Dave wasn't there to oversee it himself.

The tremendous efforts of everyone involved should be appreciated all the more when one realizes all the things that could have gone wrong had not each and every individual made the effort to cooperate. It was a combination of care, cooperation and dedication to a common goal that has brought Barre's Town Hall back to the masterpiece that it is. Had the Robinsons not been the moving force behind it all, the outcome might have been different. The outcome is that the Rededication of the Barre Town Hall will take place October 23, 1982, one year and ten months after the fire.●

HOSPITAL OFFICIAL TO RETIRE

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Mr. James C. Kirk, president and chief executive officer of the Pottsville Hospital and Warne Clinic, located in Pottsville, Pa. Mr. Kirk will retire on January 1, 1983, after 35 years of dedicated service to the hospital and the community.

Mr. Kirk was appointed administrator of the Pottsville Hospital in 1948. He has been an outstanding citizen whose contributions to the institution and the community are immeasurable.

Before coming to Pottsville, Mr. Kirk was the assistant superintendent of the Perth Amboy General Hospital in New Jersey. Prior to serving at Perth Amboy, he was an accountant for Jones & Laughlin Steel Co. in Pittsburgh and the Crucible Steel Co. of America in Jersey City.

As the administrator of the Pottsville Hospital, he was responsible for guiding the institution through several major building projects which increased the hospital's size from 150 to 266 beds, making the Pottsville Hospital and Warne Clinic the largest hospital in Schuylkill County. In addition to the hospital expansion projects, a new school of nursing building was constructed in the mid-sixties.

Mr. Kirk, a native of Port Carbon, Pa., received his education at the Carnegie Institute of Technology in Pittsburgh. He is a member of the American Hospital Association, the Hospital Association of Pennsylvania, and the Health Systems Agency of Northeastern Pennsylvania. He was also a member of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania's State Welfare Board.

Mr. Kirk is a man of many accomplishments which have benefited thousands of people, not only in Schuylkill County, but throughout Pennsylvania. Without a doubt, the Pottsville Hospital and Warne Clinic will be losing a man with exceptional talent, skill, and ability.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to honor this fine American before my House colleagues. Mr. Kirk was a true humanitarian with a complete devotion to providing the best possible health care for the citizens of Schuylkill County.●

NATIONAL PARK VISITOR FACILITIES FUND ACT

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce today legislation that will provide a viable means to solve the problems with overnight visitor facilities in our national parks for which the Government has nonroutine maintenance and rehabilitation responsibilities.

Of the approximately 16,000 buildings in national park areas, there are some 1,000 Government-owned facilities which are used for overnight accommodations of visitors and support services and in which there are no outstanding possessory interests by a concessioner. These tend to be small cabins and related facilities used by visitors seeking clean, comfortable, and safe accommodations during their park visit. Unfortunately, the rehabilitation of these facilities has often been neglected in the press of more comprehensive park plans for construction and repair, which generally focus on larger structures. Delay of necessary rehabilitation and repair has resulted in many of these small visitor facilities deteriorating to the point that they do not meet minimum health and safety standards. This bill will provide the financial, practical, and expeditious means to accomplish the needed rehabilitation to these Government-owned cabins, motels, and food facilities.

This legislation is the counterpart to S. 2715, which was introduced by Senator WALLOP in July. The Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands and Reserved Water of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources held hearings on this bill on July 30, 1982. In testimony, the bill received strong support from all witnesses, including the Department of the Interior, the National Park Service, the National Park Foundation, the National Parks and Conservation Association, and the

Conference of National Park Concessioners. The legislation would permit the combination of revenues generated from franchise fees paid by operators in the national parks, along with private contributions and management resources to upgrade the quality of national park overnight visitor accommodations. Under the bill, revenues received from concessioners' franchise fees, authorized by section 3 of the act of August 25, 1916, would be paid into a special fund, the National Park Visitor Facilities Fund, in the Treasury. The Department of the Interior estimates that revenues from concessions franchise fees would average approximately \$5 million per year. My bill would authorize this amount to be paid into the fund annually. The bill would authorize annual appropriation in this amount from the fund for grants to the foundation, with an additional appropriation authorization of up to \$1 million to be available for matching, dollar for dollar, both cash and material contributions donated to the Foundation by private citizens and corporations for restoration and repair of visitor facilities. The building program would be paid for by appropriations from the Visitor Facilities Fund to the National Park Service for grants to the National Park Foundation, which would manage the program. The foundation is a federally chartered nonprofit instrumentality authorized, in the action of December 18, 1967 (Public Law 90-209), to accept and administer gifts for the benefit of the national park system. The range of projects considered shall include the construction and rehabilitation of overnight visitor accommodations and related facilities, as well as the relocation of existing facilities to other locations within the park, or the removal of structures from the park entirely.

The National Park Foundation has established a strong record of support for the National Park Service. It has a highly qualified board of private-sector individuals who can assure the competent and effective management of this project, as well as being able to attract contributions of both cash and materials. The foundation's sole function as to concessions would be to contract privately for the actual "bricks and mortar" repairs and construction of facilities according to needs identified by the National Park Service. Improvements made by the foundation would become the property of the Federal Government.

I strongly recommend enactment of this bill, which provides an energetic and imaginative joint Government/private-sector approach to a narrowly focused, but difficult problem in our parks.●

WALTER J. SEMPROCH—ENTREPRENEUR EXTRAORDINAIRE

HON. RONALD M. MOTT

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to call your attention to the accomplishments of a Clevelander who is a prominent example of individual success, Mr. Walter J. Semproch.

Walter has owned and managed Broglio's restaurant in Independence, Ohio, since 1961. As is the case with any well-run business, Broglio's has become famous throughout the community for the quality and service provided by Walter Semproch. He has earned this exemplary position by virtue of his own dedicated efforts, and his entrepreneurial spirit.

Walter is a self-taught businessman. He was born on the southeast side of Cleveland 65 years ago. Walter attended Sacred Heart of Jesus Elementary School, and graduated from South High School in 1936. While at South High, Walter worked part time for Fisher Foods.

In 1936 Walter was employed as an "all-around" man for Kaase Bakery, his first full-time job. He worked his way from a position in the bakery plant to sales supervisor, then to sales manager. Walter went to work for Broglio's in 1954, fulfilling their need for a manager. He invested his own money—as well as a great deal of his time and energy—in the restaurant. Walter bought a quarter of the stock in 1956, and gradually acquired the remainder over the next 5 years. Since then, Broglio's revenues have reached well over a million dollars, thanks to his dedication and perseverance.

In addition to these successes, Walter Semproch is active in many community organizations in Greater Cleveland. These include the Marymount Hospital advisory board, the Cleveland Polish Society, the Sports Media Association, and, in keeping with his life's work, the Northeast Ohio Restaurant Association.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues in the House, please join me in the extension of this gesture to Walter J. Semproch. His hard work has made him an eminent member of his community, and a man we should be proud to honor.●

THE 64TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF POLAND

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on November 11, 1918, the courageous people of Poland declared their inde-

pendence, and reasserted the nation's right to live in freedom and human dignity after more than a century of enslavement.

The history of Poland and its people has been one of both triumphs and tyranny. Although one of the first democratic constitutions known to the world was established in Poland, unfortunately shortly thereafter, the Polish people saw their homeland invaded by three of the country's powerful neighboring nations. These nations exploited and brutalized the newly conquered Polish territory until 1918, and they responded with terrible repressive measures whenever the Polish people made gallant efforts to achieve self-government and to preserve their cultural heritage.

After World War I, however, the signing of the Treaty of Versailles enabled the Poles to reassert their own national destiny, and to freely develop their national, religious, and cultural institutions without foreign interference. Sadly, this glorious revival of freedom lasted only for one generation. In 1939, Poland became a victim of Nazi aggression, and her people were subjected not only to another foreign occupation, but also to the most extreme savagery, racial persecution, and brutal enslavement. Although 1945 marked the end of this Nazi oppression, the Polish people were forced to submit to a new tyranny in the form of the communism imposed with force by the Red Army.

Today, the Communists continue to be ruthless in their attempts to wipe out the culture and religious heritage of the Polish people. Nevertheless, they have been unable to completely crush the spirit of the Poles, and their desire for human rights, human dignity, and liberty. These dedicated men and women of Poland, who daily must face a dismal existence under the tyranny and oppression of the Communists, continue their fight against overwhelming odds in an effort to achieve self-determination.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join Americans of Polish descent in the 11th District of Illinois which I am honored to represent, in Chicago, and throughout the country as they commemorate the 64th anniversary of the independence of Poland, and I join them in their hopes and prayers for the success of the Polish people to one day overcome their Communist oppressors, and live in freedom in their own beloved country.●

BUSINESS LEADERS SAY "CHANGE THE COURSE"

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the voters of this country sent a strong signal to the Congress and to the administration to alter the disastrous course of Reaganomics. Since the election, nearly every economic indicator has worsened still further, and the prospects for any significant, long-term improvement of the economy has become even bleaker.

It is perhaps understandable that the architects of Reaganomics resist the calls for change when they are made by those of us who decried the strategy when it was first proposed. Now, however, even some of our country's most prominent business leaders are viewing the strict supply-side, Reaganomics course as the "voodoo economics" originally described by George Bush in 1980.

Both supporters and critics of Reaganomics would do well to read the following two articles, both by men who are hardly known as hostile to the interests of business. The first, by John Wilson, traces both the original flaws in the theory underlying Reaganomics as well as its abysmal performance in practice. It should be noted that Mr. Wilson is the senior vice president and chief economist of the Bank of America.

The second article is by publisher Malcolm Forbes, who calls for major changes in spending and defense policies as essential to a reduction in President Reagan's record-shattering deficits.

(The articles follow:)

CAN REAGANOMICS BE SALVAGED?

WE MUST INVEST IN OUR FUTURE

(By John Oliver Wilson, Delivered at the Town Hall of California, Los Angeles, Calif., Sept. 16, 1982)

Only eighteen months ago Reaganomics was born. It was an historic moment in our nation's history. Who can forget the dramatics of the event as it was broadcast live on nationwide television.

The date was February 18, 1981. President Ronald Reagan entered the packed Chamber of the House of Representatives to a thunderous standing ovation. As the Members of Congress gathered to hear the new President lay out the details of his economic program, expectations were high, for rumors had been growing that this new program would represent a dramatic departure from the past.

After first cautioning that "we can no longer procrastinate and hope that things will get better . . . they will not" the President went on to propose "a comprehensive four-point program."

It is a program, the President explained, that: First, is aimed at reducing the growth in government spending; second, reforming and eliminating regulations which are un-

necessary and unproductive; third, encouraging a consistent monetary policy that reduces inflation; and fourth, reduces taxes.

It was the proposal to reduce taxes that became the most important part of the economic program. In his proposals for tax reductions, the President was far from conservative. Tax rates were to be cut by 30 percent. Tax revenues were to be reduced by \$44 billion in 1982 and eventually result in a \$500 billion reduction over the next five years. Never before in the history of the nation had a President proposed reducing taxes by so much for such a long period of time.

Drawing upon his prodigious abilities to communicate, and demonstrating an unexpected flair for playing the rough and tumble game of political arm-twisting in Washington, President Reagan moved quickly toward a vote in Congress on his tax bill. On July 29, 1981, after a mere seven hours of debate, the President won a landslide victory.

As the newspapers reported: "In 190 days President Reagan has not only wrought a dramatic conservative shift in the nation's economic policies and the role of the Federal Government in American life but he also swept to a political mastery of Congress not seen since Lyndon B. Johnson."

It was now official. The accepted economic policy for the nation was christened: Supply-side economics. This new set of policies was expected to produce tremendous results. For 1982 projections were for an economy that would grow at a positive 5 percent real rate. Inflation would decline significantly, and the budget deficit would be a mere \$45 billion. By 1984 the budget was to be totally in balance.

It seemed almost too good to be true. Massive tax reductions would stimulate such strong economic growth that sufficient tax revenues would be generated to balance the budget.

As all of us are only too painfully aware, this economic utopia has not occurred. There is little prospect that it will.

Rather than the economy expanding at a vigorous 5 percent, we find it declining at a negative 1.5 percent rate. Rather than a mere \$45 billion deficit, we are faced with a massive \$150 billion deficit. Rather than basking in economic euphoria, we are caught in the throes of the most serious economic recession in fifty years.

We clutch for every small indicator of economic improvement, knowing that unless we are on the verge of a protracted recession, or a depression, the economy should recover. There exist numerous self-corrective forces within our economy that act to turn a recession around. These forces are very powerful. A slowdown in inventory disinvestment and continued consumer spending are the most certain forces that typically act to turn around a recession. And it is just these forces that are operating today to give us what economic strength that we have.

However it is a weak economic recovery at best: The weakest economic recovery in our entire postwar history!

The seriousness of our current economic situation cannot be underestimated. In the economic debris of this recession we will be left with a frightening legacy: The highest unemployment rate since 1941 . . . the largest number of business bankruptcies since 1932 . . . the weakest recovery in business investment in forty years.

There is the very real possibility that such debris will simply overwhelm the expected economic recovery, and we will face a continued and prolonged economic recession.

In the President's own words, "we can no longer procrastinate and hope that things will get better."

Why is the economy in such dire straits? What happened to turn the euphoria of the Reagan economic program into pessimism?

Let us look at these questions. Specifically, let us look at two major issues: First, why has supply-side economics failed? And second, what can be done to salvage Reaganomics?

I separate Reaganomics from supply-side economics, for there are strong indications that the President is no longer wedded to his initial supply-side beliefs. Even more important, if Reaganomics is to survive, it must be separated from those beliefs.

Supply-side economics as advocated in the early days of the Reagan Administration has come apart for several reasons:

One: Overly optimistic assumptions were made regarding the role of expectations in our economy.

Two: The clash between expansionary fiscal policy and tight monetary policy, and the resultant rise in interest rates, was underestimated.

Three: The main engine for economic growth was assumed to be business investment; however, the impact on investment of high interest rates, a recession, and basic structural change was ignored.

Four: The impact of disinflation on the financial position of corporations was not taken into account.

Now, let's examine these reasons for the failure of supply-side economics in more detail.

First, overly optimistic assumptions were made regarding the role of expectations in our economy.

The role of expectations in our economy has become a major topic among economists in recent years. It is well known that past rates of inflation help form expectations about future rates of inflation. And it is generally felt that changes in economic policies have a significant impact on economic behavior. But what is not known is how fast inflationary expectations change and economic behavior is altered. The supply-side economists of the Reagan Administration assumed a very rapid response.

It was assumed that there would be a very rapid reaction to the announced economic policies of the new Administration.

Inflation would decline from then existing levels of 11 percent to 6 percent or less within a matter of months.

Business investment would be strongly stimulated by the mere passage of the economic program, long before the actual economic incentives had time to take effect.

Workers and consumers would begin to respond immediately to the new tax incentives designed to encourage greater work effort and a higher level of savings.

So strong would be the response to the new economic program that the Administration projected economic growth rising to 5 percent and inflation declining to 6 percent for 1982, while most private sector economists, using more conservative and traditional assumptions on the role of expectations, projected growth at 2.5 percent and inflation of 8 percent for the year.

In retrospect, it is clear that the Administration was much too optimistic in estimating the impact of expectations.

The second reason for the failure of supply-side economics was the clash between expansionary fiscal policy and tight monetary policy.

Once the President had signed into law his historic tax cut program, he set out to prepare his first budget. This was the budget that was presented to Congress in January, 1982. It was here that serious problems began to surface.

The President proposed massive increases in defense spending, \$44 billion in FY 1983 alone, and against the strong recommendation of his advisers, he refused to accept sufficient tax increases to attain a more reasonable budget balance. Having run out of areas where social programs could be reduced, the Administration was faced with a budget deficit of \$150 billion in 1982. And rather than achieve a balanced budget by 1984, the deficit was projected to continue to be \$150 billion.

Such strong fiscal stimulus, unprecedented in our entire history, left the Federal Reserve Bank with no choice but to pursue a restrictive monetary policy. The result was an increase in interest rates. After having dropped by 600 basis points in the aftermath of the initial Reagan euphoria, short term rates soared by 400 basis points between December, 1981, and February 1982. This was the period when the financial markets clearly perceived the true implications of the Reagan economic program.

As we know, interest rates have remained stuck at these high levels until July of this year, even though inflation was significantly declining and the economy was plunged into a serious recession. The markets simply were unwilling to move until the Administration faced up to the reality of their proposed budget deficits, and the Administration showed no signs of compromise as they engaged in a head-to-head confrontation with Congress.

It was only after the seriousness of the recession was finally acknowledged, and the intractableness of the financial markets was understood, that the Administration and Congress reached agreement on a proposed tax increase. But by then, the damage to the economy, and supply-side economics, had been done.

The third reason for the failure of supply-side economics was the assumption that business investment would provide the main source of renewed growth.

Unfortunately, rather than increasing, business investment declined. Little investment occurred when interest rates surged upward. Then when the recession occurred, and idle capacity began to develop, there was no need for new investment. But more important, business is faced with an uncertain future; a future of massive structural change and intense competition.

There have been few times in our history when our basic industries have gone through such significant change. My own business, the financial industry, for instance, faces the most dramatic change in over 50 years. We face intense competition from abroad as foreign banks enter American markets in increasing numbers. At the same time such nonbanking institutions as Sears, Merrill Lynch and others are broadening into financial services. Our costs have increased manifold as we now pay market rates of interest for our source of funds. The risks of the banking business have grown substantially.

What is true of the banking industry is also true for airlines, automobiles, steel, computers, construction, agriculture, and aerospace.

At a time of such massive structural change in nearly all of our most basic and important industries, it was rather naive of

the supply-side economic plan to place so much emphasis on a strong renewal of business investment.

The fourth area where the Administration miscalculated was in the impact of disinflation on the financial position of corporations.

During the past decade of high inflation, American corporations greatly altered their behavior. Debt financing was substituted for equity financing. Short-term debt was substituted for long-term debt. Capital investments were made assuming continued high inflation. Expectations about future income and profits were increased. Above all, borrowing was greatly expanded. All of these changes were normal reactions to a high inflation era. However, these actions created tremendous problems for all of us when disinflation occurred in 1982.

With the decline in inflation, the prices of products also dropped. Furthermore, many of your industries were locked into labor contracts where the cost of labor declined less rapidly than prices, and debt obligations where interest rates remained high. Consequently your business firms have been faced with declining prices but continued high cost for labor, interest payments on debt, and other fixed costs. The result has been a tremendous squeeze on corporate profits.

To counter this profit squeeze, firms have been scaling back on their investment plans. They have greatly cut all controllable expenses and delayed research and development activities. At the same time they were forced to continue borrowing at high interest rates in order to survive.

When the history of the 1982 recession is written, the most unusual occurrence will probably be the impact of disinflation on corporate financial strength. And this impact was almost totally excluded from consideration in the Reagan economic program.

Having discussed what has brought about the failure of supply-side economics, we now turn to the more interesting—and relevant—question of what can be done. Can Reaganomics be salvaged?

My answer is yes, for the Administration has many pluses working for it.

The first plus is the American economy. Our economy is still by far the largest in the world, accounting for one-quarter of the total gross national product of the global economy. This means that our markets are large and rich. We still offer the greatest economic opportunity for any manufacturer or entrepreneur in the world, whether that individual be American, Japanese or French.

The second plus is that we have absorbed the postwar baby boom into our labor force, thus we no longer face this problem that slowed down our productivity growth during the nineteen-seventies.

The third plus is that we have completed much of our investment in cleaning up our environment, another source of slower growth in productivity. We can maintain our commitment to a clean environment with far less resources than in the past, and now allocate those resources to other areas.

The fourth plus is the fact that the OPEC shock, which ushered in the era of high energy costs, is behind us, and we are well on our way towards adjusting to a more energy efficient future.

These pluses are so strong that the decade of the nineteen-eighties holds out the promise of potential growth rates in productivity that are two to three times that of the past decade.

However, to realize this potential growth we must alter our current economic policies. Specifically, these policies must be designed to expand investment in America's future.

This may seem a strange recommendation to make since the Reagan economic program was largely sold to business and to the public on its ability to increase productive investment. Indeed it was viewed as the most pro-business economic program in many years.

Unfortunately, it has put American business in their most precarious financial position in fifty years. It has stifled private investment. It has slashed public investment in housing, education, research and development, alternative energy sources, and public transportation. It is jeopardizing our future.

What needs to be done?

The first policy change would be to reduce the expected budget deficits. No one would suggest that we should attempt to balance the budget this year. To do so would only plunge the economy into a depression. Nor it may not be possible, or even desirable, to reach a budget balance in the foreseeable future. But to consciously undertake policies that are designed to produce budget deficits of \$100 to \$150 billion from not until at least 1985, long after the economy will presumably be recovered from this recession, is to ask for trouble.

The second policy change would be to achieve greater balance between fiscal policy and monetary policy.

Smaller budget deficits are essential to achieving this balance. Once the proposed budget deficits are attained, the FED will be in a position to moderately ease on the growth of the monetary base without endangering our long-run commitment to fighting inflation.

Currently, the FED is attempting to expand the money supply, but with large budget deficits this is a risky undertaking. It is only because of the weakness of the economy that the FED is able to ease to the extent it has without setting off renewed inflationary expectations and higher interest rates.

The third policy change is to reduce proposed increases in defense spending.

The Reagan budget proposes to increase federal government outlays by \$322 billion between 1981 and 1987. Two-thirds of this increase is earmarked for defense! Two out of every three additional dollars spent by the government between now and 1987 will go to defense. (The remaining amount is slated for social security and medicare-medicare.)

The defense establishment and the elderly will receive every single dollar of proposed budget increases for the next six years. There will be no increases for research and development . . . no increases for education . . . none for energy, public transportation, natural resources, and housing.

It will be impossible to achieve a more balanced budget without reductions in the \$204 billion increase planned for defense. We simply do not have enough social programs left to be cut. Nor will procedural reforms, such as constitutional amendments to require a balanced budget or changes in the budget procedure, solve the problem. The solution requires some difficult political decisions on budget priorities; which leads me to my final proposal for change.

The fourth policy change is to increase both private and public investment.

Almost all of the emphasis in the current economic policy debate has focused on private investment. But private investment, by

itself, will be insufficient to do the job. We need stronger and better public investment as well.

Unfortunately this is the area that has received the sharpest budget reductions. If we examine proposed budget outlays for the next five years in terms of four major categories: Defense, income security and health, general government operating expenditures, and public investment, we find that the only area where large reductions are proposed is public investment.

Defense is slated to increase from 24 percent of our budget in 1981 to 37 percent in 1987. Income transfer programs such as social security, medicaid and medicare will remain constant at 47 percent of the total. The cost of operating government, including interest on the debt, will remain constant at around 15 percent of the total. But public investment will decline from 16 percent of the budget outlays in 1981 to just 6 percent in 1987. We will reduce outlays on public investment by nearly one-half.

This is a high cost to pay.

At a time when our major competitors—the Japanese, Germans, French and other industrialized nations—are increasing their public investment, we are reducing ours. At a time when they have programs for strengthening their industrial base, we have none. We need more investment in research and technology, new developments in energy and computers and a better educated labor force—not less.

We must face the fact that for the overall economic health and security of this nation, we must take a careful look at our expenditure priorities. We must achieve a better balance between fiscal policy and monetary policy. We must increase both our private and public investment. We must invest in our future.

While these policy changes are not politically popular, Congress and the White House have no choice. If our political leaders do their job, and we voters support them in their task, I am confident that Reaganomics will survive. But more important than Reaganomics, I am confident that our economy will survive.

Thank you.

[From Forbes Magazine, Dec. 6, 1982]

FACT AND COMMENT

(By Malcolm S. Forbes, editor-in-chief)

SOMEONE HAS TO GIVE, AND THAT SOMEONE IS THE PRESIDENT

There's just no way the Congress can, should or will go along with an Administration budget that projects a \$200 billion deficit. The Administration would be nuts to submit such a folly.

If the White House does, the Congress—principally the House's substantial Democratic majority—will write its own budget. The President will veto it. This shoot-out will bloody not just the Administration, the Congress, the Republicans and the Democrats, but—of far greater consequence—will abort our struggling economic recovery.

The defense budget is going to be cut appreciably. And should be. It's utter foolishness for the Secretary of Defense & Spending & Travel, Cap the Butterknife to throw a fit when Budget's Stockman asks him for his order of priorities on cuts in weapon systems. (For the foremost candidate for such, see below.) Cuts are going to be made and one would think that Secretary Weinberger would want to have some input instead of an output of tantrums.

Then there's going to be either a rescinding of the programmed additional income

tax cut or the imposition of additional taxes. Or some of both, billions more in cuts in federal, social and welfare programs? Forget it. Neither the lame duck Congress nor the new one will do anything but a nick here and a nick there.

Until the economy's flourishing again, the President has to tack to make progress against the economic and political winds beating hard against the Administration's basically sound thrust.

ONLY A DUNCE COULD PACK SUCH DENSITY BETWEEN TWO EARS

It may seem beyond believing, but the Defense Department really is proposing to base the controversial, unfathomably expensive MX missile in a cluster of silos about 1,800 feet from each other. One hundred of them. The idea?

The Soviets would aim so many missiles at this cluster that they'd bang into each other and explode before any hit the target. Yup, it's actually what they're proposing.

"Dense pack," it's called. A dunce pack they are. ●

WHAT THE WAR IN LEBANON AND THE FALKLANDS TELLS US ABOUT OURSELVES

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, the wars in Lebanon and the Falklands provoked a flurry of articles on "lessons learned."

The article below by William S. Lind is another, but one with a difference.

Lind looked not only at the questions of what and why events unfolded as they did, but also at why our official institutions interpreted events as they did.

It is this perspective that makes Mr. Lind's essay unique, for the greatest lesson of those two wars is what they tell us about ourselves.

I urge my colleagues to read Bill Lind's fine essay.

SIMPLE TANKS WOULD SUFFICE

(By William S. Lind)

Thanks largely to the threat of nuclear weapons, major powers do not fight many conventional wars anymore. This is a development for which we should be very grateful, but it represents a problem for our military planners and strategists, for whom war is the only genuine opportunity to learn from experience. Since World War II, entire weapons systems have been developed, put into service, and retired as obsolete, without their builders ever knowing if they would have worked in an actual battle.

So the wars that erupted last spring in the Falklands and the Middle East—whatever their political necessity or impact—had special significance in the current debate between the Pentagon and the "military reform" movement. In the press, this fight is usually portrayed as a battle between proponents of sophisticated, high-technology weapons and advocates of cheap, low-technology weapons, but this is an oversimplification.

The first principle for military reformers is one of tactics: the importance of innova-

tion and agility—what is called "maneuver warfare"—as opposed to the ponderous, inflexible style of "attrition warfare" favored by much of our military establishment. Reformers like weapons that lend themselves to this maneuver style of warfare, and they point out that complex weapons that look good on paper don't necessarily work in the dust and chaos of battle. As a result, they argue, our defense dollars would be better spent buying a lot of relatively simple weapons rather than a few expensive, complicated weapons.

Which side of this debate did the experience of real wars in the Falklands and the Middle East support? If you read the newspapers, you might have concluded that the Pentagon had won a stunning victory. American military officials have been particularly eager to take credit for Israel's success in Lebanon. "Pentagon chiefs boast that real wars justify fancy hardware," began an account in the Wall Street Journal. The Washington Post reported that "interviews in the Pentagon suggest the outcome thus far in Lebanon supports the view that the more sophisticated weapons are worth the extra price." Gen. David C. Jones, the retiring chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, allowed that "It should put to rest the argument of our equipment being too complicated."

Where were the real lessons of the Falklands and Lebanon wars? The facts aren't all in, but the ones that are suggest not.

Take Lebanon first. Whatever else the Israeli action was, at a tactical and operational level it has, as of this writing, been brilliant. The Israelis used surprise, speed, and unorthodox tactics (such as amphibious landings of mechanized forces) to shatter the enemy's cohesion, in a style of warfare reminiscent of the German blitzkrieg through France in 1940. Israel's success points up the importance for combat of tactics, of daring leaders, of an army that is agile and innovative. This is precisely the maneuver style of warfare American forces have generally been unwilling or unable to emulate. (The failed Iran rescue mission was the most striking recent example of American inflexibility. With only five of the six helicopters required by their "plan," our commanders couldn't do anything except call the whole effort off.)

But looking at Lebanon the Pentagon didn't see tactics, only hardware. Even in that department, its claims to vindication are dubious. After Israel demolished Syria's Russian-built SA-6 antiaircraft missile batteries, for example, there was considerable boasting about how newfangled American weapons had defeated the Soviet missiles. "Where are the low-tech boys now?" cackled one air force officer to the press.

However, while information is still sketchy, the key to the Israeli success is more likely to have been tactics than technology. According to most reports, the Israelis destroyed the SA-6s with missiles that home in on radar after using drones—pilotless airplanes—to lure the Syrians into turning their radar on. Israel probably used American Shrike or Harm missiles—nothing new or particularly fancy. We have had them since 1967, and Israel used lots of them in the 1973 war.

The Pentagon and press have also boasted about the performance of the costly (\$25 million apiece) F-15 jet fighter ("flying electronic marvels," said Newsweek). Yet the gun-camera films available to date from air-to-air combat over Lebanon are from Israeli F-16s—the simpler, cheaper U.S. fighter—

not from the complex F-15s. Nor do our generals like to point out that the Israeli airplanes outnumbered their Syrian opponents, probably by about three to two. So the Lebanon experience certainly doesn't support the Pentagon's crucial prediction that a few high-tech planes can defeat a swarm of less advanced aircraft—precisely the situation our F-15s would find themselves in if they ever took on the Russians. Finally, the real decider in the air over Lebanon was, as usual, pilot skill. You could probably safely bet that even if the Israeli and Syrian air forces traded planes, the Israelis would still triumph.

The military establishment's post-Lebanon rush to take credit for its favorite weapons was reminiscent of one of the canards that emerged from the 1973 war. For several years after that war, it was claimed that the complex, radar-guided, air-to-air Sparrow missile, the *raison d'être* of the F-15, had been responsible for about a third of the Arab aircraft shot down. Then Israeli General Hod let out the full story: lots of Sparrows were fired, but their performance had been abysmal. The Israelis credited them with between zero and one kill.

In the latest Middle East war, as in the last (and in the Falklands), the missile that did work was the infrared-seeking Sidewinder. This is not such a complicated weapon. And because it steers itself without radar it can be launched from relatively simple jets—like the F-16's or Britain's now famous Harriers—that don't possess an F-15's expensive on-board radar system. Military reformers have consistently supported the Sidewinder for precisely that reason, while the Pentagon has pushed the Sparrow, which costs over ten times as much per missile.

Another widely touted winner in the Lebanon war was the American-built E-2C Hawkeye surveillance aircraft. Press reports speculated that Israeli Hawkeyes must have picked up Syrian planes as they taxied down their runways for takeoff. These reports strain credulity, however, given the Hawkeye's previously poor showing at picking out planes over land (as opposed to over water)—unless the Israelis somehow modified the planes to help them distinguish low-flying aircraft from "ground clutter."

In fact, the Israelis frequently alter the weapons we sell them, perhaps because, unlike the planners in the Pentagon, they know their own survival will more than likely depend on whether the weapons work. They designed their own tank, the Merkava, rather than buy the fragile, gas-guzzling \$2.7 million Abrams M-1 tank that our own GIs are being equipped with.

Finally, you may have noticed in the TV news shots how Israeli troops in their American-built armored personnel carriers have not really been in them but on them, riding on the outside or hanging out the hatches. Our own troops did the same in Vietnam. Why? Because if the carrier hits a mine when the troops are "buttoned up" inside, as the designers say they should be, they all die. If they are inside when the carrier is hit by one of the many light antitank weapons found on modern battlefields, they burn to death, because the aluminum hull vaporizes and burns. The U.S. Army is now buying a new personnel carrier, the Bradley Fighting Vehicle. It costs eight times as much as the current carrier. Again, everybody is expected to ride inside. Again, the hull is aluminum.

The "lessons" the Pentagon has drawn from the Falklands have been equally per-

verse. Here the central issue is big aircraft carriers versus small ones. The fact is that the Argentine air force, operating at the extreme limits of its range and using mostly old-fashioned "iron bombs" rather than fancy guided missiles, sent four modern British warships to the bottom. This should, logically, trouble the U.S. Navy, whose entire surface fleet is currently dependent on just over a dozen ships, in the form of its large, nuclear-powered carriers.

In the same war, Britain's smaller carriers, *Invincible* and *Hermes*, acquitted themselves well. They were able to continue operations in bad weather conditions and (if scattered reports are correct) after sustaining damage—two things only big carriers were supposed to be able to do, according to Pentagon dogma. Britain's vertical-takeoff Harrier jets—favored by reformers largely because they can take off from the decks of small carriers as well as from rudimentary landing strips—held their own in the Falkland skies against Argentina's faster *Mirages*.

Despite these events, Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger quickly announced that there had been no "brand-new lessons" from the Falklands fighting, even suggesting that "there has been a strengthening of the case for large carriers." Adm. Thomas B. Hayward, the chief of naval operations, agreed. With a hubris that one expects the gods have duly noted, Hayward proclaimed that American technology and tactical know-how would surely prevent any "two-bit navy around the globe with a handful of missiles" from sinking our ships.

The Pentagon's main argument was that big nuclear carriers like the U.S.S. *Nimitz* can carry long-range reconnaissance aircraft, which the smaller British carriers could not. In theory, such aircraft can spot enemy ships and aircraft before they get close enough to launch any Exocet-type missiles. Argentine planes, bragged Secretary of the Navy John Lehman, "never would have come close to a U.S. carrier task force."

But that is wildly overestimating the ability of reconnaissance planes—or any of the navy's other elaborate antimissile defenses, like the new \$1.1 billion Aegis cruiser—to protect our precious carriers. In exercise after exercise, "enemy" planes, submarines, and missiles have been able to find holes in these defenses and clobber the carriers.

No, if there is one thing to be learned from the South Atlantic war, it is probably that all surface warships are now vulnerable to attack from both air and sea. It follows that we should try to distribute our navy's offensive power over as many ships as possible, to minimize the chance that a single successful attack would cost us an entire battle. The issue is not, as Secretary Lehman suggests, whether the British would rather have had the *Nimitz* or the *Invincible* off the Falklands. For the price of one *Nimitz*, we could buy six or seven *Invincibles*.

The vulnerability of surface ships is not a recent revelation. In that sense, Secretary Weinberger is right to the extent that he suggests there were no "brand-new" Falklands lessons. The first warship to fall victim to a modern antiship guided missile, the Israeli destroyer *Elath*, went down in 1967, and the evidence has been mounting ever since.

Has the Pentagon consciously deceived the public? I don't think so. There is a scarier probability: that Messrs. Weinberger et al. actually think what they say they think.

The most fundamental problem we face, then, may not be high-tech versus low-tech, or big versus small, but the sorry state of our military thinking in general. We seem to tolerate a quality of analysis in our military that would never be tolerated in, say, medicine, where a large number of lives are also at stake.

Part of the problem is sheer ignorance. Understanding warfare requires, above all, a grasp of military history. It is not going too far to suggest, for example, that neither the British ground victory in the Falklands nor the Israeli success in Lebanon can be understood without an understanding of the revolution in German infantry tactics during World War I, where modern maneuver warfare started. Yet our military schools and colleges teach little history. With no historical context in which to place new events, our experts sometimes cannot understand even that which they can see.

The largest part of the problem, however, is the institutional setting in which military thinking occurs. Virtually all components of our armed services are large bureaucracies, and the process of selecting a new weapon, or planning a mission, is one of brokering and logrolling: "If my shop lets yours get that assignment [or mission, or weapon], then mine gets this other one in return." The focus in such a brokering process is not external—on the enemy—but internal—on how to come up with something that everybody in the bureaucracy can live with.

This internal political process is stressful, intricate, and time-consuming. Changing a decision means going "back into the tank," back into the endless meetings, the hairpulling and -splitting, the threats to careers if some interests don't "get their share." No one wants to alter a compromise, once arrived at, even though the external world is changing all the time (as it changed when the *Elath* was sunk). So there is an inevitable tendency to juggle, misstate, or ignore the external world, to obviate the need for change.

Big carriers offer something for every branch of the bureaucracy—comfy flagships for admirals, planes for naval aviators, nuclear power plants for Admiral Rickover's old shop. And for the navy, over the past three decades, the large aircraft carrier has been the Procrustean bed for which reality is cut or stretched to fit. An unwritten rule in the navy's war games prohibits an American carrier from being declared sunk. Thomas Eitzold, a professor of strategy at the Naval War College, has reported that "In more than five years of experience as an umpire and adviser in high-level war games, I have witnessed the unwillingness of senior naval officers to permit carriers to be sunk, even when taken under overwhelming attack."

Real threats are simply ignored. The Russian navy is primarily a submarine navy—the Soviets have only about thirty major surface ships armed with antiship missiles. They have almost 300 subs. In a hearing early last year, Admiral Hayward admitted that "There is no commander afloat today who would consider the use of the aircraft carrier as the principal weapon to go after submarines, large or small." In other words, no one in the U.S. Navy would apparently suggest using carriers to fight the main element of the Russian navy.

In many respects one of the military forces that fought in last spring's real-life battles closely resembled our own. Divided into dickering branches, cursed by a rigid bureaucratic chain of command, brimming

with false confidence in its own abilities, incapable of quick maneuver or innovative strategy, it had adequate weapons but didn't know how best to use them, and it was quickly overwhelmed by a smaller, more skilled force. As one American commentator said after the valiant defenders of the Malvinas collapsed in a heap: "Don't laugh. We are also Argentines."*

LATVIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on November 18, Latvians throughout the world celebrated the 64th anniversary of the creation of the modern Republic of Latvia, and on Sunday, November 14 of this year, a commemorative program in observance of this event was held in the Taft High School auditorium, sponsored by the United Latvian Association of Chicago, which is under the able leadership of Ilmars Bergmanis, chairman.

Although the Communists continue in their attempt to destroy the heritage and culture of the Latvian people, the Soviets have been unable to crush the spirit of Latvians and their determination to live in a free Latvia. Excerpts follow from the report on the Implementation of the Helsinki Final Act in Soviet Occupied Latvia: 1982, prepared by the World Federation of Free Latvians, which describe recent acts of brutality by the Soviets against the Latvians.

Excerpts from the report follow:

SOVIET GOVERNMENT'S POLICIES IN THE BALTIC STATES: A PROGRAM OF TERRORISM

State Terrorism in the Baltic States is Increasing and Methods Used by the KGB are Becoming More Brutal.

*** The development and extent of individual persecutions is as follows:

1. Political prisoners previously sentenced to long-term imprisonment are still confined to Soviet prison camps.

2. Innumerable civil and human rights activists still are being held in special psychiatric institutions.

3. Show-trials are staged, where the advocates of civil and human rights are imprisoned or placed in special psychiatric institutions.

4. There is a noticeable increase in the number of assaults directed against those people who have voiced opposition to Soviet policies. Some have been murdered by "unknown assailants."

5. Arbitrary acts of terrorism are being committed against former political prisoners and other persons in disagreement with the regime.

6. Simultaneously, propaganda campaigns are being carried out more frequently in the mass media in order to intimidate the general populace.

In spite of the intensification of political terror and the brutality of KGB operatives, opposition is increasing within the population, especially among the younger people.

Notwithstanding diverse appeals and petitions to the Soviet Government, to the United Nations Committee of Human Rights, to the CSCE Followup Conference in Madrid and to other international authorities, political prisoners from Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, sentenced to long-term imprisonment still are incarcerated in Soviet prison camps. No leniency towards human rights activists has been shown by the Soviet Government. Frequently the state of health of these prisoners is alarming, a condition aggravated by the fact that medical assistance from abroad is prohibited by the Soviet authorities. Some of these prisoners are:

	Sentenced in—	Term of imprisonment (years)
Latvians:		
Andrejs Pice	1973	15
Ivars Grabins	1967	15
Zanis Skudra	1978	12
Richard Spalins	1979	7
Juris Bumeisters	1981	15
Dainis Lismanis	1981	10

In most of the cases mentioned above, the completed prison term is followed by several years of internal exile.

Recently, there has been an increase in the number of show trials being staged in all three Baltic States and many civil and human rights advocates are being sentenced to long prison terms. In Latvia activists from diverse groups have been brought to trial and received harsh sentences.

Those sentenced frequently have been immediately subject to enforced psychiatric treatment. The following are but a few examples:

	Sentenced in—	Type of sentence
Latvians:		
Juris Bumeisters	1981	15 years imprisonment.
Teovils Kuma	1980	3 years imprisonment followed by internment in a psychiatric hospital.
Dainis Lismanis	1981	10 years imprisonment.
Juris Vinkelis	1982	2 years imprisonment.
Alfreds Zarins	1981	3 years imprisonment.

There is an alarming increase in terrorist activities carried out by "unknown assailants" against the clergy, the defenders of civil rights and other dissidents in the occupied Baltic States. By eliminating some people and interning others in psychiatric institutions, the authorities are relieved of the complicated task of organizing the scarcely plausible and often embarrassing show-trials. Generally the victim is taken by

surprise, and the relatives are pressured to acquiesce. Some of the more recent incidents are:

On August 19, 1980, the body of Latvian Catholic priest Andrejs Turlajs was discovered in a lake;

On December 13, 1980, the Latvian Peteris Samtins, a stage worker at Riga Dailies-Theater, was assaulted by two militiamen in uniform. A few days later his corpse was recovered from the river Daugava and relatives were told that he had committed suicide. They were made to understand that further queries into the matter would be undesirable;

In the summer of 1981 the Latvian, Janis Vitolins, was found dead in Riga prison OC-78-7. Shortly before his imprisonment he had tried, in vain, to gain entrance into the United States Embassy in Moscow;

In the summer of 1981 a Latvian teenager was killed, again in prison OC-78-7 in Riga. He and three friends had been imprisoned at the beginning of the year because of their involvement in the duplication of a forbidden history book on the mass deportations carried out by the Soviet regime in Latvia;

Acts of terrorism, such as assassinations, administration of drugs or overt physical assaults are being carried out in order to intimidate persons undesirable to the regime, in particular, and the population, in general:

In October 1980 the Latvian, Peteris Tomsons, a Public Controller was tortured in the militia station in Riga, insidiously treated with drugs and upon release, beaten up in broad daylight. In his capacity as Public Controller, he had disclosed widespread improprieties and graft in the food distribution system of his district and had reported this to the District Attorney;

In August 1981, an attempt was made to assassinate former Latvian political prisoner, Maris Tilgals. At an intersection "unknown assailants" shoved him against the red light, into the path of an approaching vehicle. Because of his youthful dexterity, and the driver's presence of mind, Tilgals managed to survive;

During the entire year of 1981 the Latvian, Gederts Melngailis, periodically was assaulted publicly and it has been made known to him that further acts of terror will follow. He is a practicing Christian and attended academic courses of the Evangelical Church in Riga in 1974-75;

In January 1982 an attempt was made in Riga to run down the former Latvian political prisoner, Maigonis Ravins, with a snowplough. Alerted by shouts from passers-by, he was barely able to save himself.

ADDENDUM

Since this report was prepared, the World Federation of Free Latvians has received additional information regarding terror and human rights violations by the Soviet government—

Augusts Zilvinskis, a Catholic priest of the Svente parish, missing since December 1981, was found murdered in a forest near Griva on May 7, 1982.

On December 21, 1981 Ieva Biševaja, a Latvian Seventh Day Adventist, was sentenced to a year and a half of hard labor for mailing religious literature.

On November 18, 1981, Latvian Independence Day, several teenagers displaying the outlawed national flag were arrested. One of

those arrested was Igors Āuravskis, 17 years old. His fate is not currently known.

Another teenager Haralds Burnickis (17 years old) has been continuously terrorized by the KGB until he became severely depressed and was placed in a psychiatric clinic.

At a Latvian high school in Ilguciems (Public High School #54, Baltaja iela 22) KGB agents examined student handwritings in order to discover the author of handwritten political proclamations.

Mr. Speaker, many Latvians have emigrated to the United States over the past several decades because of the brutal oppression and tyranny of the Communists. They have brought their hopes of freedom to our shores, and have contributed to the greatness of our country. I am pleased to join Latvian Americans in the 11th District which I am honored to represent, and Latvian Americans all over this country in their desire that the people of Latvia will again achieve self-determination and live in freedom and human dignity in their beloved homeland.●

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, November 30, 1982, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

DECEMBER 1

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on the nominations of Donald P. Hodel, of Oregon, to be Secretary of Energy, and Martha O. Hesse, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of Energy for Management and Administration.
3110 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings on infrastructure job opportunities.
4200 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the current situation in Lebanon.
4221 Dirksen Building

Joint Economic

Closed briefing on the allocation of resources to the Soviet Union and China.
5110 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Judiciary

To hold hearings on pending nominations.
2228 Dirksen Building

Small Business

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Small Business to review government findings of the Securities and Exchange Commission business forum on small business capital formation.
2359A Rayburn Building

DECEMBER 2

9:30 a.m.

Rules and Administration

To hold hearings on Senate Concurrent Resolution 32 and House Concurrent Resolution 153, measures authorizing a bust or statue of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., to be placed in the Capitol.
301 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Judiciary

Agency Administration Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings on the indemnification of and contributions to government contractors.
2228 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
Business meeting, to mark up proposed legislation appropriating funds for fiscal year 1983 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

DECEMBER 3

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold joint hearings with the Committee on the Judiciary on H.R. 5949, proposed Cable Copyright Act.
235 Russell Building

Judiciary

To hold joint hearings with the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation on H.R. 5949, proposed Cable Copyright Act.
235 Russell Building

Joint Economic

To hold hearings on the employment/unemployment situation for November.
2128 Rayburn Building

10:30 a.m.

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the nomination of John H. Holdridge, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Indonesia.
4221 Dirksen Building

DECEMBER 6

2:00 p.m.

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the nominations of Lev E. Dobriansky, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Commonwealth of

the Bahamas, Samuel F. Hart, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to Ecuador, and Victor Blanco, of California, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Inter-American Foundation.
4221 Dirksen Building

DECEMBER 7

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
3110 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works

Business meeting, to consider proposed amendments to S. 2432, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1983 and 1984 for programs of the Solid Waste Disposal Act and Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (pending on Senate calendar), and other pending business matters.
4200 Dirksen Building

Finance

Energy and Agricultural Taxation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1911 and S. 2642, bills providing for the establishment of reserves for surface mining land reclamation expenses and for the deduction of amounts added to such reserves.
2221 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
2228 Dirksen Building

DECEMBER 8

9:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
235 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Armed Services

To hold open and closed hearings on the MX missile and associated Presidential basing decisions.
1318 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings on the nomination of George W. Douglas, of Texas, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner.
235 Russell Building

Rules and Administration

To hold hearings on computer and communications systems for the U.S. Senate.
301 Russell Building

Select on Intelligence

Closed briefing on intelligence matters.
S-407, Capitol

2:00 p.m.

Judiciary

To hold hearings on pending nominations.
2228 Dirksen Building

DECEMBER 9

9:30 a.m.

Rules and Administration

Business meeting, to consider pending legislative and administrative business.
301 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Judiciary

Separation of Powers Subcommittee

To hold hearings on judicial leniency.
5110 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

Agency Administration Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Equal Access to Justice Act (Public Law 96-481).
2228 Dirksen Building

Select on Intelligence
Closed briefing on intelligence matters.
S-407, Capitol

DECEMBER 10

10:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Household Goods Transportation Act (Public Law 96-454).
235 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 2503, S. 2680, S. 2681, and S. 2824, bills providing for the reinstatement of certain oil and gas leases.

3110 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

Juvenile Justice Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 2856, increasing the penalties for the sexual exploitation of children.

2228 Dirksen Building

DECEMBER 13

10:00 a.m.

Governmental Affairs
Energy, Nuclear Proliferation and Government Processes Subcommittee

To hold hearings on Government payments and the potential for fraud.

3302 Dirksen Building

Select on Intelligence

Closed briefing on intelligence matters.

S-407, Capitol

DECEMBER 14

9:30 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on the report of banking regulators regarding the Penn Square National Bank in Oklahoma.

5302 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Motor Carrier Act (Public Law 96-296).

235 Russell Building

DECEMBER 15

9:30 a.m.

Governmental Affairs
Energy, Nuclear Proliferation and Government Processes Subcommittee

To hold hearings on Government debt collection procedures.

5302 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs

Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on computer matching programs to detect fraud and mismanagement in Government programs.

3302 Dirksen Building

DECEMBER 16

9:30 a.m.

Governmental Affairs

Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee

To continue oversight hearings on computer matching programs to detect fraud and mismanagement in Government programs.

3302 Dirksen Building

Small Business

To hold oversight hearings on the small business investment companies (SBIC) program of the Small Business Administration.

424 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Select on Intelligence

Budget Authorization Subcommittee

Closed meeting on budget matters relating to intelligence activities.

S-407, Capitol